Pages: 1-133

JOINT MEETING OF THE ATLANTIC HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES AND BILL FISH ADVISORY PANELS

JOINT MEETING

April 1-3, 2002

at

Holiday Inn

Silver Springs, Maryland

(Evening session)

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 2002

BLUEFIN TUNA ISSUES - Continued

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: What I'd like to do is take a half an hour for the panel to discuss the general category. We will cut it off at half an hour to allow some of the members of the public who have traveled to the meeting to speak on the issue. Then after the public members have spoken, we can again take up discussion with the panel. And of course the panel can continue on tomorrow, if necessary, to discuss bluefin tuna issues -- if we don't finish all the categories this evening.

Should we set a cutoff time? Or just take it as it goes? 10 o'clock? 9 o'clock?

UNIDENTIFIED: I'd be happy to propose a --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Russ Nelson, you have a proposal for us in terms of a cutoff time?

RUSSELL NELSON: No, I have a suggestion for getting started. You all can decide the cutoff time.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay.
RUSSELL NELSON: I'm going to retain

the opportunity to decide my own cutoff time.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED: Well, I will then suggest a 10 o'clock cutoff time and we'll resume tomorrow.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. So, we won't go past 10 o'clock. So, again the plan would be for the panel members to discuss bluefin tuna general category issues and -- for half an hour. Then we'll take public comment and then the panel can resume their discussion.

So, with that, who would like to have the floor? Russ and then Rich.

RUSSELL NELSON: Well, I'd defer to whatever Rich has got to say, of course, but I would like to suggest just for my own edification on this issue, I think it would be helpful if we could ask my friends from North Carolina to lay out some of the issues that they're interested in, sort of set the stage for what we're going to be talking about, what the public might have to say.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay.

Again, we've had a review from Pat on the operation

of the general category from last season, and

obviously there's always concerns with how we manage the fishery throughout its range, the effort control schedule, the monthly quotas and things like that. So, with that, we'll let North Carolina have the floor.

PRESTON PATE: Thank you, Chris, and I'm grateful for the opportunity to come here tonight and discuss with the panel an issue of much interest to North Carolina's fishery management program and North Carolina's fishermen. Since I'm not a regular attendee at these meetings, there may be some around the table that do not know who I am, and I'll introduce myself. I'm Preston Pate. I'm the Director of the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries and an ex officio member of this group.

There are a couple of people that I would like to introduce before we get into the substance of our presentation, and first ask Doctor Louis Daniel, who's on my staff and the brains behind this operation. I just drove him up here for the purpose of getting him here and introducing him.

Also, Mr. Pete Manuel, who I think is in the audience. Pete is the President of the

Winter Bluefin Tuna Association based out of
Morehead City. And Jerry Schill, who's the
Executive Director of the North Carolina Fisheries
Association. They also have with them some members
of their organizations which will be speaking to
this issue during the public comment period.

We're here to try and lay out for you some ideas that we have about adjustments to the management of the general category quota for bluefin tuna such that North Carolina fishermen have an improved opportunity for harvest and a more predictable season on an annual basis.

North Carolina has been very fortunate over the last couple of years to have benefited from transfers from other categories into the general category of quota during a time when the bluefin tuna were still off of our coast, and during the time when the fish were bringing the highest market value.

And it's become obvious to our fishermen that this is a tremendous economic asset that can help them during times when other fishing opportunities have been foreclosed for various reasons. And I've heard several comments about that

made over the last day and a half, and how these closures are affecting flexibility and affecting the health of our commercial industry.

We feel like that we have some good information to share with you tonight and some logic behind the request that you're going to -- that we're going to make and look forward to talking to this group and individuals about it in more detail.

So, with that as a matter of introduction, I'd like to turn to Louis Daniel now and have him present some more details.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought the South
Atlantic snapper/grouper plan was complicated.
After talking to a lot of the folks around the
table, as well as in the audience, as well as folks
that aren't here, I came to a realization that there
is a lot of misunderstanding about the North
Carolina fishery. And the intent of my two-page
discussion is really just to present you with what
we feel are the facts of this case, and what the
issues are in North Carolina.

And I'd like to start with just reading you a little quote. Bluefin tuna appear off

Cape Hatteras in midwinter and apparently remain through April. This fishery is just being explored. Present indications based on fish deliberately hunted down, baited and boated, are that the bluefin tuna do pass through Gulf Stream waters off Hatteras in large numbers, and that this fish, like the marlin, will become a major North Carolina big game species. End quote.

These statements appeared in a publication distributed by the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development in 1966. In the same publication, a list of North Carolina saltwater fishing records lists a 491-pound bluefin landed off Hatteras by a fellow named Dick Derbyshire in 1963.

During the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's, bluefin tuna were regularly sampled from federal longline surveys conducted off the Carolinas and Southern Virginia. Opportunistic commercial sampling and logbook records indicate that bluefin landings in North Carolina in the 1960's and the 1970's. Bluefin tuna landings data are available from NMFS for the period 1964 to 1966, and from the North Carolina Statistics Program from 1979 to the

present.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The occurrence of bluefin tuna off the coast of North Carolina is not a new event, nor is the fishery, particularly as the term fishery is defined in the Magnuson-Stevens amendment.

The U.S. bluefin tuna fishery appears to have peaked in the early '70s at around 11, 12,000 metric tons, at which point the landings began to drop off. Much of the fishery during that time period was directed towards the smaller fish taken in the purse seines as far south as North Carolina, where we do have indications that there was a purse seine fishery off of North Carolina during that time period. And in 1981 ICCAT -you've heard the history -- indicated a concern for the stock and a quota was implemented in '82, and landings have remained, you know, relatively stable since that time. But it was not really until the late '70s, early '80s, that a lucrative market developed for the large fish, primarily those taken by harpoons and longline gear for export to Japan. And from this history, it appears that the entire east coast fishery is relatively recent when compared to many of our other east coast fisheries,

particularly the commercial hook and line fishery.

Fishermen off North Carolina have not developed a bluefin tuna fishery for several reasons. Restrictions that prohibited sale and the lack of market conditions certainly played a significant role. But additionally, and probably most -- of the more important factors, is that other species were available to South Atlantic fishermen that were more abundant and more valuable than the large and difficult to handle bluefins.

This is precisely the reason that

North Carolina and more southern interests did not
pursue bluefin tuna allocations during the initial
quota discussions. However, as numerous commercial
fisheries, long the mainstay of our fishery, become
or became increasingly restrictive, weakfish,
bluefish, summer flounder, striped bass, river
herring, monkfish, dogfish, snapper/grouper,
dolphin, etcetera, the need to be able to diversify
into other fisheries is and was critical.

While the value of the fish is certainly an incentive, the abundance of bluefin tuna off North Carolina during winter, and the ease and safety in which they can be taken, necessitates

a seasonal allocation for permitted fishermen who choose to capitalize on the fishery off North Carolina.

One of the goals and objectives of the HMS plan is to manage the U.S. bluefin tuna allocation for optimum yield. North Carolina submits that an adjustment to the October to December subquota that would allocate 90 metric tons of bluefin tuna to the December subquota would go a long way towards achieving those goals.

NMFS, the average ex vessel price of bluefin tuna at 42 landing ports, suggests that the value of bluefin in yield per kilogram, which varies and fluctuates, is greatest during the winter and early spring, when the U.S. is preempted from selling fish. Average price per kilogram is two to three times greater from December through April than from June through November, apparently as a result of market demand and fish quality in terms of the higher fat content.

Some of the most valuable bluefin tuna that I was able to find that were sold, sold during December based on these data compilations -- and one example that I found were three fish that

sold out of New York on February the 4th, '99 for an average price of \$40 per pound, versus the average fish sold in September/October, averaging around \$13 a pound. So, having at least some fish available for U.S. fishermen during the most lucrative market season optimizes the use of this valuable resource.

A concern expressed by this group in the past has centered around the moratorium on licenses in North Carolina that would permit fishermen to land in our state. We now have through our Fisheries Reform Act, we now have a license to land and sell, that is available to any non-resident, and allows that licensee to land bluefin tuna taken in the EEZ off North Carolina. This resolves that problem in our opinion.

We would further submit that the economic incentive to fish off North Carolina is very high, as a result of lower dockage fees, lodging costs, etcetera, compared with ports further north. The run to the fish is also greatly reduced from other locations, with fish regularly occurring within three to five, six miles off the beach, minimizing fuel costs and allowing fishermen to pick their days to avoid questionable weather conditions.

The intent of our proposal is to be
as inclusive as possible and provide what we believe
are lucrative opportunities for any general or
charter head boat category permit holder. During
the past two years, when the small amounts of fish
were left over from the northern fishery, we had
vessels from New Jersey, Virginia, Florida, and

South Carolina fishing alongside North Carolina

vessels.

The seasonal adjustments and the seasonal adjustment bulletins that are submitted by the National Marine Fisheries Service indicate that the intent of the adjustments is to quote, allow for maximum utilization of the general category subquotas, to collect a broad range of data for stock monitoring purposes, to help achieve optimum yield in the bluefin tuna fishery.

While those statements are certainly consistent with the FMP, the current management practices and allocations are not. And you know, I know you've all read the things, but I mean one of the primary statements made throughout the SAFE Report, throughout the fishery management plan, multiple times in each document, is it is important

to keep the fisheries categories that collect CPUE information, i.e. the angling and general categories, open over as long a time period and as large a geographic area as possible, because CPUE can be influenced by many short-term and local factors.

Maximum utilization and optimum yield is more closely achieved through a December subquota. Thanks.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you. Of course we have over the past several years — I guess it was about 1995 where we embarked on this new management regime with respect to subquotas by period and even restricted days to achieve exactly those ends, was basically spreading out the fishery, not only for maximizing fishing opportunities throughout the migratory range of the species, but also to assist the stock assessment with respect to CPUE data collected over a broader time period and over a broader geographic range.

So, thanks for that presentation.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible.)

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: If you have a copy that you could provide us for the record

of the meeting. Sometimes the verbatim transcripts don't convey the exact sense, depending on how well the tapes can be heard by the transcriber. So, anytime that you have a written record, it's always best to include that.

So, at this point we'll again entertain comments from the panel for about another 15 minutes and then we'll open it up to public comment. After public comment has been received, then we'll again take up panel members' discussion. Rich Ruais, Peter Weiss.

RICHARD RUAIS: Yeah, okay. So we're going to get back to the North Carolina issue in just a little bit and continue with what we were working on before? Comments on the effort controls, etcetera, etcetera, for the general category?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, again, this is part of the same picture per se, insofar as the -- what we normally would do around this time of year is issue a proposed specification that would indicate the restricted days and the monthly quotas and other aspects of general category management.

RICHARD RUAIS: Okay, all right.

Well, before I talk about the few issues that we have about the season this year, I did want to tell Mau that I did find the rebuilding plan and what I relayed to you earlier was correct, for everybody to know. The provision that's in the rebuilding plan, 1998, which supersedes any of the prior recommendations, it's Number 16 and it says there shall be no directed fishery on the bluefin tuna spawning stocks in the western Atlantic in spawning areas such as the Gulf of Mexico.

So, it actually takes care of both of the concerns you had. There's no numerical reference to what's a directed fishery or not. And it's not simply limited to the Gulf of Mexico. If we find other spawning areas, we'll be able to take similar action. So, I hope that addresses that concern.

MAUMUS CLAVERIE: But that no directed fishery is the same language as in the older one, isn't it?

RICHARD RUAIS: Yeah, but this is -there are 17 measures now in the bluefin rebuilding
plan. In the compendium of documents -- I wish Kim
was here right now, but in the compendium of

documents that ICCAT puts out on what are the current prevailing international agreements related to bluefin, this 17 point rebuilding program is the controlling package for western Atlantic bluefin tuna right now.

There's a whole host of other types of temporary measures and agreements that we've had in the past in 1991, 1992, that made various changes to sharing arrangements. When you do a new one, as we did with the rebuilding plan, it supersedes the old package. Is that enough on that point or you still have a problem?

MAUMUS CLAVERIE: Well, I don't have a problem.

RICHARD RUAIS: Oh, okay.

MAUMUS CLAVERIE: The old rule was no directed fishery in the Gulf spawning ground and the new rule contains the same language.

RICHARD RUAIS: With the exception that there is -- you had some notion that there was a definition of what a directed fishery was and that anything more than one fish was not -- could be considered a directed fishery and therefore we would be in violation of some kind of an ICCAT agreement.

And what I'm saying is it's not there from -- because of the current program, if it ever was.

MAUMUS CLAVERIE: My concern was misunderstood. NMFS defined what a directed or what a nondirected fishery was. Originally, the definition was only two fish can be brought back to the dock per trip, then it went down to one fish, then it said one fish with --

RICHARD RUAIS: I got it, I got it.

MAUMUS CLAVERIE: -- a bunch of other stuff aboard. And now they're talking about going back up to two fish. It's not an ICCAT thing. It's ICCAT criteria of no directed fishery. So, Glenn can define directed any way he wants.

RICHARD RUAIS: Okay. No, but that was the -- then the misinterpretation was that you were thinking that there was some kind of ICCAT restriction that we had to be careful for, and what it really possibly amounts to is an interpretation that NMFS had put out in some prior year.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible.)

RICHARD RUAIS: Right, correct, correct. Okay. On the general category, one of the things that we're very concerned about, as Chris

mentioned earlier, is there's clearly been a shift in the fishery in the early season. It used to be that in the month of June and July, and the reason why there's 360 some odd tons in the first quota period June through August, is that that was when --- where the bulk of the general category catch was landed.

What we've seen since at least 1995 is a shift in the other direction. Most of the fishermen think it's related to intense herring pair trawling activity that reduces the forage base inside the Gulf of Maine, and consequently the bluefin come in — it appears they come in for a short period of time, Maine fishermen get some fish and northern Massachusetts, New Hampshire fishermen, as well, and then the bluefin don't stick around. They take off looking for food.

The result of that is the last three years, at least, we have rolled over in some cases more than 50 percent of the first subperiod quota, which is -- for those of you who don't know, the quota is broken down 60/30/10. June through August is 60, September is 30 and October is 10, if I got that right. And now what we're seeing is that Maine

is essentially out of the fishery. The last few years we started off with minimal restrictions on the general category and yet we still haven't been able to achieve any significant catch in the early part of the season.

So, what we're proposing is that you go the next step and start the season off in June with two a day, so that we can have an opportunity to try to catch some more of that first subperiod quota.

If you're familiar with the regulations, you know that NMFS has the authority to put rules in quite rapidly. They can add days off. They can reduce back to one fish a day. They can do anything they -- they can do any of those options from one fish to three fish and get the days in pretty quickly.

So, what we want to see is two a day to start a general category season off. No days off, except for around the holiday, as we've done the last couple of years. And for September and October, we want to see the same thing. What we think we should be doing is starting off with maximum flexibility and then using your regulatory

authority to make sure that we stay within the subperiod quotas. So, that's what we have for the general category right now.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

UNIDENTIFIED: Just to reiterate what Louis has... did a very good job of explaining, I'm going to speak a little bit from the fishermen's point of view. I mean, we've got hardworking, taxpaying U.S. citizens, fishermen, in North Carolina -- and not only North Carolina. lot of boats there in the wintertime from Virginia and South Carolina, Florida, I'd say the whole southern region, that have participated in all the fisheries through the years. The dolphin wahoo, striped bass, dogfish, flounder, king mackerel, all of these fisheries. And at certain times we've had to take cuts. We've had to quit fishing entirely for a lot of these species so they could rebuild. But we have participated in the management process and I feel like in this particular fishery, the bluefin fishery, that we've never had an opportunity to participate in it.

Now, the last two years, for whatever reasons, there was some quota left over due to transfers and other reasons, and we thank you for

that. It made a lot of guys Christmas's down there last year and year before last, because it's been pretty tough times due to closures and due to different things.

But this little bit of the pie has meant a lot to these guys, and I guess this last year we really -- we got a little bit, but we really thought we were very surprised when it went to two fish a day and then the restricted fishing days were gone, but these guys feel like that we deserve a piece of the pie. And I know the history and I know the pie was this big and now it's been reduced and everybody's got a spoon ready to dig in.

But we feel like in this particular case that we are certainly entitled and I hope you can find a way somehow or another to get us some allocation down there so these guys can start participating and know that they're going to participate, not kind of waiting for a last minute handout, you know, if we -- it's a lot easier to plan, and these guys are planning, get their equipment ready if they know they can be assured of some type of set fish. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. Several things. The first point I'd like to make is that I'm here as a representative of the South Atlantic Council and the South Atlantic Council sent a letter to Doctor Hogarth on March the 13th and they supported this allocation for this subregion quota for December, because we have boats landing in North Carolina from Florida. We have boats landing from Virginia. We have boats landing from North Carolina and from South Carolina. And so it's considered to be, from the Council standpoint, this is an extremely important issue. So, I'd like to make sure that that letter is on record for this meeting.

The second point I'd like to make is that when I read the SAFE Report and on page 10-8 where it talks about a new fishery, that really concerned me because number one, I could not find the definition of a new fishery in the Magnuson Act. I don't believe it's there. I think that's an inappropriate term to use in trying to define this fishery. And it's certainly not new in North Carolina, as Doctor Daniels pointed out, the landings that we've had and the history that we've had.

And Chris, I'd like to just, if I could, just read a couple things. This is a memorandum for record of a meeting that you conducted in Kill Devil Hills. And Will Etheridge was there, Rom Whitaker was there, myself was there, a number of other people were there. And the date of that meeting was May the 1st and it was in 1997, and it was having to do with the bluefin tuna ruling at that time. Okay?

It's a page and a half long, and I wrote it the night I got back from the meeting, but the sentence I wanted to read to you for the committee is that the fish are in North Carolina now. We should be allowed to catch our fair share of the quota given to us by the -- to the U.S. by ICCAT. Something must be done to ensure that the North Carolina anglers and our commercial fishermen can participate in this fishery. There were other comments made with regards to that, but to me that was just a critical issue.

Another paragraph in here says that we've been bringing these issues to your attention for the last three or four years and nothing has been taken. If you back that up, that goes from '97

back to like '93 or '94.

Another point I'd like to make, and I don't think that Doctor Daniels had it in his statement, but we've had a very, very strong recreational fishery in North Carolina that goes all the way back to '66. But in particular in the new era, so to speak, since 1993. And it's very important to our economy there.

And also I'd like to point out that we didn't get an allocation in this fishery until 1982, before the first quota was even set. So, to classify in the SAFE report, to use the term new fishery, I just feel is unfair and unappropriate to our region and to what we're asking for. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: I'm not going to talk about the North Carolina issue right now, because I guess we're going to wait for that. I just want to address some of Rich's points regarding this effort control quickly.

Last year was the best year we've ever had as far as control of the tuna fishery was concerned in New England -- or in the northeast.

Brad and Pat did a terrific job of working with the fishermen, and I think Rich will agree or anybody

will agree who fished up there, that we had the least amount of problems, we were the most in control.

We started this season off with a bunch of rules that we were able to change. It was one fish a day. I believe we had a few days off, not too many. We ended up having almost no days off. I think the only days off were the Japanese holidays, if I'm correct. And when the time came, we all shifted to two fish a day and everybody was happy.

I just find it's easier to have the rules in place to keep the fishery under control and then with Pat and Brad working with us, to shift very quickly into another mode when it's time to shift.

Fishing is a funny business. I remember when we caught this quota in August. Now, that was a few years ago, but we did catch it in August. Maybe Rich is right. Maybe the herring thing has messed up this fishery completely. But I'm not disagreeing with two fish a day or whatever, but we don't want to start off with two fish a day. We want to start off with one fish a day, and if

need be, we'll switch to two fish. You know, we all agree to it. And I think if Pat and Brad, their philosophy pretty much is if the organizations and the fishermen want something and it's within the realm of NMFS to do it, they'll do it. They did it last year. They can do it this year. And hopefully they'll do it ongoing. So, that's as far as that issue is concerned.

RICHARD RUAIS: Well, I'm very sensitive to the comments that Rom makes, Wayne makes, Louis makes, and everyone else that I've met from North Carolina. Sensitive enough that I went down there to specifically talk with them and I think I've tried to show where there are some alternatives where we can work this thing together and try to get someplace positive -- in a positive fashion as opposed to any kind of a fight.

But I do have to ask that there's also appreciation for where we've been in this fishery. This is the year 2002 and it's basically 20 years now since we the historical fishery has been living with a 65 percent reduction.

And that causes a lot of pain. It causes a lot of economic disruption. There aren't a

lot of alternatives in New England right now. If you're familiar with the groundfish fisheries and some of the other fisheries up there, they don't have other alternatives. And the limited fishery that we've got in the bluefin fishery is a great relief.

Prior to the 65 percent reduction, harpooners in the northeast were catching several hundred tons of fish a year. They went down first quota to 130, they're now down to 54 tons. That's the entire quota. Prior to 1982, rod and reel fishermen were catching several -- more than 1,000 tons a year in several years, and quite a few more than a 1,000 tons in several years. First restrictions coming on brought that category down to the 600, 700 ton range, as well. They've been living with that 65 percent reduction.

The purse seine fleet used to catch thousands of metric tons of bluefin tuna. They went down to 386 tons, 301, 250, still suffering under the burden of regulation.

It's hard for me to think of a rationale to take back to them and say we know you've been conserving under this quota to rebuild

this resource and it's pretty clear that it's having a positive effect, despite the fact that it's a grossly inequitable program on the international scale. But now you're going to have to give something up to -- because the resource is expanding its range here, clearly in the western Atlantic, and there's more and more fish, you're going to have to give up more to make room for another protected subquota fishery.

And I struggle to come up with what justification I can give for those fishermen who also are under a burden for the plan. So, if you can help me with that, then that would make my life a lot easier.

I'd also dispute that North Carolina is not in this fishery. Right now you've been -it's a coastwide general category quota. If there's quota leftover, as there has been for several years, you're getting a shot at the fishery. Granted, it's limited, not protected.

You've got an angling category fishery right now. 45, 50 tons, whatever it happens to be. It's a start. The other -- if you look at other two major regions, the Mid-Atlantic and New

England, you'll see that predominantly you have either a commercial fishery or an angling category fishery.

We don't have substantial recreational activity in New England in the bluefin tuna fishery. Conscious decision on the part of the agency. In the Mid-Atlantic, it's primarily an angling category fishery, not a heck of a lot of general category sales.

In North Carolina what's being asked for is to have both a commercial and a recreational fishery. That's fine, and hopefully we're going to get there someday. But you might look seriously at some of the alternatives that I've presented to you as a way to get there sooner -- as soon as can be possible, recognizing that everything that happens in bluefin takes a long time, whether it's a rebuilding plan or whether it's getting into the fishery, changes to the fishery.

And in terms of volume of quota -- I know you've all heard me say this -- we don't jump around with large numbers like 90 tons and 150 tons. We talk more in pounds and a few tons here or there, and that's just the reality of living under this two

stock hypotheses that we hope we can get out from under sooner rather than later.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:

Thanks, Rich. Recognizing that several members of the public have come to the meeting specifically because we had scheduled the public comment period for this evening, we'll take those individuals that had indicated they wished to speak.

I don't know. Is John Dorland coming back, does anyone know? Maybe if Ellen and Bob don't mind, the members of the public who wish to speak can use that mike right there. And that way we can all hear you. Pete Manuel.

PETE MANUEL: I want to thank you all for having us up here. And thank Rich for coming to see us the 27th. Really appreciate your time. And you know, basically the Magnuson-Stevens Act is the same thing as the constitution to the American people, except this addresses fisheries.

We sympathize with you all's position of being regulated by ICCAT, but we also feel that we are not being treated fair or equitable for Standard 4, and we also understand that we need to join forces with you and our politicians to go to

ICCAT to help -- we're all U.S. citizens. We should not be fighting amongst ourselves.

We feel like there's enough quota there that 90 metric tons is not an unreasonable request. For us to spend our funds and our effort with our politicians to help you, we've got to have something in return. And I mean, we've got people that sink net for a living, that got to catch 100,000 -- crokers, 100,000 pounds of crokers at a nickel a pound for five grand. Two of these fish make their winter. And I don't think that's asking anything unreasonable if we're going to work with you all.

And as far as having a recreational fishery and a commercial fishery, NMS set it up that way. If North Carolina wants to have a recreational fishery, general category fishery, the categories are there. You can't tell North Carolina or the southern region that we can't have both. I mean, it's like you can't have, you know, ice cream with your apple pie. I mean, it sounds good, but it's not reality.

You know, and I feel like that all these people that gave up their day for two days are

going to lose two days of fishing. All these guys are commercial or charter boats that come a long way up here to speak their peace, and 90 metric tons of general category is not unreasonable. The way I look at it, if you took each category across the board and took six percent out of it, no one person gets hurt. And in turn, you get our support and our funds to help fight with ICCAT. And after this, I really just don't know how else to be any more reasonable.

And I met with Rich and I really sympathize with the millions of dollars that you all have spent over the years fighting with ICCAT and with scientists to do what you're doing. But the Magnuson-Stevens Act, Standard 4, the way I see it, gives us an opportunity to have a small piece of this pie.

We're not asking for half. We're not asking for an opportunity to make up the lost revenues that we lost the last several years by being regulated out of it. And asking for two fish in the beginning of the season without giving us a subquota is Russian roulette. I mean, there's no guarantees.

If we had a subquota for December, you'd catch ten fish a day. It wouldn't make any difference to us if that's what you all decided to do, because that's what it was right thing to do. But start off with two fish a day is just a means to regulate North Carolina out of the fishery again without an opportunity to have any fish. And I'm going to turn it over to someone else. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Ken

Kramer.

KEN KRAMER: Hello. I've been a commercial and charter boat operator in North Carolina for 30 years. Needless to say, this is not something I do very often.

There are a lot of people that would have liked to have attended this meeting today to do the same thing I'm doing, which is to present a case for a fishery, North Carolina and the southeast region. Unfortunately, the weather was real good at home today and most of them are in the ocean. The ones that aren't in the ocean are in the boat yard trying to get their equipment together so they can go make a little money this spring.

Another limiting factor in our

attendance is the fact that this meeting was only scheduled seven days ago, which I'd like that to be entered into the record.

We've repeatedly requested an agenda for this meeting. When we got an initial agenda there was no public comment hearing on the agenda. At the request of our politicians from North Carolina, this public comment period was added to the agenda. And please correct me if I'm wrong on these statements, but I believe I'm correct.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, just for the record, we had scheduled the meeting earlier than that. We were working on again a draft agenda. It's always been our intent to work with the panel to identify priority issues. So, we didn't want to predefine the agenda. That is a continuing topic of discussion, evidently, with respect to how we conduct the panel's business.

We tried to circulate something as soon as we could. The meeting is always open to the public, by definition, by requirement, and we normally try to schedule several defined periods of public hearing, public comment, throughout the meetings. I don't know that that should have been a

surprise to anybody.

I'm not exactly familiar with what was being circulated in North Carolina. I know we tried to get the word out as soon as possible, when we could schedule the meeting.

Certainly we tried to check with the panel members first as to their availability. But I do understand there was some confusion and we'll do a better job next year of getting things set up with more advanced notice. And it's guaranteed that there will be public comment periods throughout the meeting.

KEN KRAMER: Okay. Well, maybe I misunderstand circumstances of that. The other point is that these very same people who aren't here tonight can't afford to take two days off to come here to petition for something that we believe is rightfully ours to begin with.

In the southeast states, we have bluefin tuna available from late November through March. As a matter of fact, the yellowfin fishery started in North Carolina waters and bluefin have become quite a nuisance down there in the last two weeks. Basically because of the gear differences,

if you get around the bluefins you're wiped out.

They're still there. There's lots of them. And I

don't know if this has any bearing on your stock

assessment, but it should.

These fish that are available during this period are quality fish, they can be sold during very favorable market conditions, and they're accessible to participants in other small boat fisheries that have been adversely affected recently by management and availability conditions. And I don't need to get into that. You're already familiar with that.

So, basically we have people at home that need to catch some of these fish. They need the money. This will take pressure off other stressed fisheries, which is a point that Mr. Lee made from the Southeast Management Council perspective.

I wasn't going to say a lot of stuff. I was actually implored to be nice. Mr. Ruais, it's not an agency decision that Massachusetts has a commercial rather than recreational fishery. It's a fishery decision based on the fact that the general category is open and fish can be sold. Period.

It's not an agency decision. It's not an agency
decision that North Carolina participates in a
recreational fishery. It's a fact that the general
category is not open and fish can't be sold. If you
reverse those conditions, you'll find that we won't

be recreational fishing.

So, you have the same opportunity to recreational fish that we do, Mr. Weiss. However, your people choose not to do it. They go kill one and bring it home and they sell it. In your tournaments -- I saw a newsletter from one of your tournaments that was either Hyannis or Nantucket, where the winner killed two fish, giants, and brought them to the dock and won the tournament with two giants.

Well, obviously if he's recreational fishing he can't keep a one -- one a year; is that correct? And once again, I'm trying to be nice.

Rich, here's your justification to your membership.

And this is like preaching to the choir, but I want this in the record. This is from the Magnuson
Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act

Standard Number 4.

Conservation and management measures

shall not discriminate between residents of different states. If it becomes necessary to allocate assign fishing privileges among various United States fishermen, such allocations shall be fair and equitable to all such fishermen reasonably calculated to promote conservation and carried out in such a manner that no particular individual, corporation or other entity acquires an excessive share of such privileges. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Thank you. Rich Blakeney.

RICHARD BLAKENEY: Good evening. I'm Richard Blakeney. I'm a general category fishermen from New Hampshire that harpoons and rod and reels for bluefin tuna. I'm here speaking on behalf of the Atlantic Commercial Fishermen's Alliance and our Executive Director cannot be here tonight because of other fisheries issues which he is working on right now, so I'd like to read a statement written for him on behalf of all of our members, if you'll bear with me.

The Atlantic Commercial Fishermen's

Alliance is an organization of commercial fishermen

who in the Highly Migratory Species fisheries pursue

Atlantic bluefin tuna and North Atlantic swordfish primarily by harpoon.

Our members participate in the Atlantic bluefin tuna fishery in both harpoon and general categories and in the North Atlantic swordfish fishery and the limited access hand gear category.

ACFA members land the overwhelming majority of fish in both fisheries that are captured by harpoon. The harpoon fishery is a clean size selective fishery which unlike other gear types has virtually no bycatch of either juveniles of the target species or bycatch of non-target species. It is a historical fishery deeply rooted in New England tradition and recognized by National Marine Fisheries via the creation of directed fisheries in both the Atlantic bluefin tuna and swordfish fisheries.

Nevertheless, as we expressed to this panel last year, the harpoon fishery remains unrepresented in this body. We are disappointed that the Department of Commerce saw fit to turn down our request for representation on this panel. We believe that as representatives of the directed

harpoon fishery that we deserve a voice in the formulation of policy which affects our fishery. Because the Department of Commerce declined our request for representation, National Marine Fisheries is not receiving advice from harpoon fishermen who most actively participate in these directed commercial fisheries.

We reiterate here our request for representation and will continue to seek nomination to this panel. We sincerely hope that the Department of Commerce will look favorably on our request in the future.

Several issues have been raised in the fishery since the last HMS AP meeting last year and we are aware of requests to this panel from other interested fishery participants. We would like to address these issues here now and submit our comments.

Regarding the harpoon category quota. The base quota for the -- excuse me -- Atlantic bluefin tuna harpoon category remains at 54 metric ton, approximately 300 fish. This base quota was raised last year by an in-season transfer to a total of 90 metric ton, and we appreciate these efforts on

the part of NMFS. Nevertheless, the issue of the harpoon category base quota remains to be addressed.

When the harpoon boat category was created in 1981, National Marine Fisheries allocated 131 metric ton to this fishery. The following year, after the ICCAT actions which cut by well over half the U.S. quota, the harpoon category was substantially reduced to 25 metric ton.

The following year, as ICCAT doubled the overall quota, the harpoon boat category was set at 45 -- excuse me, 54 metric ton level, where it remains today. In the intervening 20 years, all other Atlantic bluefin tuna hand gear categories have been restored to historic levels. The general category last year exceeded 900 metric ton. The angling category has enjoyed substantial increases in its base quota. Yet the harpoon category alone amongst all hand gear categories has not seen adjustments to its base quota as the overall U.S. quota has recovered.

This failure has led to significant disruptions in the fishery as a whole. Harpoon fishermen have, due to the very small allocation, in many cases been forced to buy a second vessel so

they can fish in both the harpoon and the general categories. This has led to unfortunate and counterproductive conflicts, as general category participants have objected to harpoon captains and their fish spotters moving into the general category after a closure of the harpoon category.

The National Marine Fisheries can and should address these matters. It has by its inaction over decades largely created the present conflict over the use of fish spotters. By failing to provide an adequate opportunity for these historic participants, some of them for over 30 years, to participate in a harpoon fishery which by all rights should have participated in the restoration of other hand gear fisheries to the historic levels.

We call on National Marine Fisheries to rectify this matter. We desire to work with representatives of the fisheries who have been given the privilege of representation on this panel to affect an equitable restoration of the Atlantic bluefin tuna harpoon category to its historical share of 131 metric ton.

Regarding days off and effort

controls. The Atlantic bluefin tuna general category has placed in system a days off designator to ensure the catch rates when high -- catch rates are high and are limited in order to ensure the historic pattern of catches in New England waters. This was the original purpose of the Atlantic bluefin tuna and general category effort controls.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Instead, what involved was a distortion of this purpose to limit effort for its own sake largely to permit part-time participants and maximize their participation in the fishery, to the detriment of full-time commercial fishermen and fish processors, to pay for full-time dockage, hire help, etcetera, in what became a part-time fishery. This situation should be reviewed. We suggest that in the early part of the season, when Atlantic bluefin tuna catch rates are low, usually June 1st to July 15th, that the general category bag limit be raised to two fish per day. And once catch rates have accelerated the bag limit, they should revert to one fish a day and then the catch rates exceed 15 to 20 metric ton per day, days off should be implemented in order to preserve the traditional pattern of catches in New England waters, much like

Rich talked about earlier.

Item 3, the early opening for the purse seine vessels. We are aware that representatives of the purse seine vessels in the Atlantic bluefin tuna fishery may request an early opening for their fishery. We object to this request and urge the panel to recommend against its implementation. In the Atlantic bluefin tuna fishery, the purse seine vessels are capable and indeed regularly do place hundreds of fish on the markets at one time.

This has the annual effect of depressing prices generally for the remainder of the season. We see no basis for starting at an earlier time than the annual ritual of the purse seine vessels putting the prices for Atlantic bluefin tuna in the basement.

Put another way -- I'm reading this, so bear with me. This panel should recommend against any change which would shorten the limited period when catch rates are sufficiently low that prices are generally high.

Purse seine vessels alone, among all other Atlantic bluefin tuna participants, have

allocated to their vessels an individual quota.

They need not compete with other seiners for their fish. Since they alone retain the right to continue to use fish spotters, they already possess considerable advantages over all other Atlantic bluefin tuna fishery participants.

We do not suggest that these advantages are inappropriate, especially given the historic nature of these vessels, their crews and the owners in the Atlantic bluefin fishery. On the other hand, we see no reason to agree to allow these advantages to disadvantage everyone else in the form of longer periods of depressed prices.

One Atlantic bluefin tuna purse seine crew was unable to fill its quota last year. That quota was carried over to this year and the vessel is under some pressure to land all its fish. The reason this boat was unable to land its quota was a combination of loss of a very skilled fish spotter, who decided not to fly for them anymore because of personal reasons, as well as an interruption in the aircraft traffic from the tragic events of September 11th, 2001.

We do not believe the entire fishery

management regime should be changed to accommodate the unusual circumstances. We do not favor any changes in the purse seine season.

Number 4, regarding the North
Carolina quota. We believe that the request from
North Carolina for a share of the U.S. ICCAT
allocation of Atlantic bluefin tuna should be
honored. We do not, however, agree that this quota
should come from the general category. Instead, we
believe that all categories, general harpoon, purse
seine, incidental, longline and angling, should
participate in a small adjustment and in order to
allow fishermen from North Carolina to participate
in this fishery.

The root of U.S. Atlantic bluefin tuna problems is at ICCAT. It is unsound policy and fundamentally unfair for European nations who continually overfish what science is telling us is an oceanwide stock of fish, while U.S. fishermen struggle to divvy up an unequitably small part of the pie. Moreover, NMFS itself though unsound policies originating out of the Southeast Fisheries Center created this problem by advocating for its genesis at ICCAT in the early 1980's.

∠

United States must reconsider its

ICCAT policies. Unilateral fisheries conservation

efforts which were the policy of National Marine

Fisheries and which were advocated by conservation

groups and well-intentioned but misguided efforts to

show leadership have only worked to disadvantage

U.S. fishermen relative to their counterparts from

nations which stood up for the interests of their

citizens. This problem was created by the U.S. at

ICCAT and must be solved at ICCAT.

In the meantime, there is no good reason to deny American citizens access to this resource merely because they do not live in New England. Indeed, we believe that it is in our collective interest to bring to light in other regions of the country the U.S. ICCAT policies which have led to this state of affairs, where good American citizens from New England feel that they have to resist efforts by fellow Americans to gain access to a public resource, and where fishermen must arrive by the busload to seek a share.

We should accommodate this request, not just because it is the right thing to do, but because it is in our collective interest that the

citizens of North Carolina see firsthand the end result of the misguided ICCAT policies which have struggled New England -- excuse me, strangled New England fishermen for over two decades.

The allocation should be borne by all user groups equitably, however, and not just by the general category, and further, New England fishermen should have the same rights enjoyed by North Carolina fishermen who come to New England every summer to go the North Carolina and participate there.

Provided that these conditions can be met, we believe the fishermen to the south of New England should be able -- been allowed to participate in the Atlantic bluefin commercial hand gear fishery.

And lastly, swordfish limited access hand gear permits. The National Marine Fisheries Service made available for a period of time limited access hand gear, i.e. harpoon and rod and reel swordfish permits. Unfortunately, since most harpoon fishermen now participate in the bluefin fishery and not in the swordfish fishery, many fishermen who fish by harpoon were not aware that

such permits were available. As the result, many fishermen with a history of substantial participation in the harpoon fishery did not obtain such permits.

We ask that National Marine Fisheries consider reopening this category with specific notice to all bluefin fishermen with a history of harpoon landings, or that an alternative that such fishermen be deemed automatically to be eligible for such permits with renewal of a general or harpoon category permits.

National Marine Fisheries took a significant well-founded step when it created a directed hand gear fishery for swordfish. Due to the success of industry led ICCAT recovery plans, swordfish are again reappearing on the grounds south of Martha's Vineyard and the southern edge of Georges Bank.

We would like to yet again see a flourishing swordfish harpoon fishery in New England and do not want to see NMFS efforts' in this region flounder due to poorly advertised availability of permits. Thank you for your opportunity to allow me to comment. If you have any questions, you can ask

me now or see me now or I have copies of these out 1 front. I have some more copies available if you 3 didn't get one. 4 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: It looks like there's a number of folks who would 5 probably like to ask you some questions, but I'm 6 7 going to have to hold off on that and let's just get a few more members of the public to speak, because 8 9 they --10 UNIDENTIFIED: I'm here. Just ask. 11 I'll come back. 12 RICHARD BLAKENEY: I do want an 13 opportunity at some point to talk about the gross inaccuracies and distortions in this letter with the 14 15 panel. The Advisory Panel needs to know. 16 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: 17 That's fine. But again, many members of the public who came specifically for this evening's session, as 18 19 I understand, are not planning on spending the night 20 So, let's let them have their opportunity here. first. We can continue to deliberate. 21

JERRY SCHILL: Thank you, Chris, members of the panel, Reverend Hogarth, don't fall

22

23

24

Schill.

asleep. I'm Jerry Schill, President of North
Carolina Fisheries Association. The last time I
came to Silver Spring with a camera and took
pictures of people that came on a bus from North
Carolina, I read some very disparaging comments
about me on the Internet, so I don't expect to see
them tomorrow.

I'd like to just thank you for the opportunity to comment this evening. I know it's been a long day. But I did just think of a great idea for Judge Judy to come up with any penalty if she deems anybody to be guilty in her court, and that's to serve on this panel.

I don't know how you all do it, sitting around here for three days. I know it's a chore, and we do appreciate the opportunity to comment and your spending the late hours here.

I do have to pick on you a little bit, though, Chris, because of the public notification and the agenda. I understand that you can't give everybody a personal invitation, as the nuns used to say in grade school. An invitation on a silver platter is not what's expected. But as someone who represents an organization that's been

around for the mere 50 years, I think it would be kind of nice that we didn't have to call Walter Jones's office to find out exactly what's going on. I think that you need to communicate a little better.

I would like to talk about summer flounder, since the fish look so much like a bluefin tuna. You know, we're very sensitive to this issue. You don't have to go very far. If you're around fisheries management circles, certainly not highly migratory when you talk about summer flounder. But there are some analogies and that is we talk about the allocation issue all the time and how it's split up. But one thing we're very sensitive to is the fact that North Carolina gets a good share of the summer flounder quota for the commercial quota on the Atlantic coast.

But keep in mind, too, that North
Carolina is the one that established the quota not
only for our state, by and large, but for many of
the states up and down the coast. Our boats are not
bashful about going where the fish are, and having
to pack and do whatever they can to make a buck, to
make a living, to put bread on the table. They were

certainly good at that in states up and down the coast when it came to the summer flounder issue.

So, when we talk about this issue, we are very sensitive and we do know a bunch of damn Yanks from up north are the ones that are responsible for the current bluefin quota. If it wouldn't be for the guys up in the northeast, in particular the East Coast Tuna Association, there wouldn't be much to talk about for the blood and sweat and the money that they've already put into it. We fully recognize that.

The one thing that I found in the 15 years that I've been with NCFA is if you have more quota, you have a lot more love. You have a little bit of quota and the contentiousness grows. You look at the summer flounder issue and Pres Pate will be very quick to tell you that it was much easier to manage the summer flounder quota this year. They not only did a very good job in doing so, but there was also more quota this year.

And once you start getting payback for the prices that were paid, then certainly the contentiousness starts to dissolve. Bluefin tuna, I don't think, is going to be any different. I know

it's not going to be any different. Get more quota, the contentiousness is going to go away.

But recognize that -- recognizing that, you know, and we know that North Carolina is not a Johnny-come-lately in the bluefin tuna fishery. You've heard Louis Daniel articulate that very well. We are, however, a Johnny-come-lately as far as any organized effort when it comes to going to ICCAT and exert any political influence in these battles. That's just because we've got a lot of other things on the plate. It was articulated very well here already, that there's a lot of other pressures coming down on commercial fishermen in North Carolina and all states, for that matter. And because of that, this issue is a lot more importance to us.

Although we're not -- although we are relatively new participants to this process, and have never really gotten involved with the ICCAT process except for a few who have sat around the table as advisors or through their active involvement or friendly dialogue with the East Coast Tuna Association and the Bluewater Fishermen's Association, but again, the North Carolina Fisheries

Association and the Division of Marine Fisheries has not been actively involved, as our Congressional delegation has not been involved in it.

That being said, North Carolina in general, and North Carolina Fisheries Association in particular, will work in concert with the U.S. interests along with our political contacts, i.e. the Congressional delegation to try and influence all efforts at ICCAT. And again, we do believe that something needs to be done in the interim to help North Carolina and its commercial fishermen and the economy of our coastal counties to help the serious situation that's facing us.

We appeal to this panel to make recommendations to the agency to do that immediately and we pledge our support to do whatever we can in the political realm and otherwise, as well as to our ICCAT Commissioners to assure that the U.S. can take care of its domestic interests when you go to ICCAT. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:

(Inaudible.)

NED MCCLUNG: Good evening. I'm Ned McClung and I run the Charter Boat Magic out of

Atlantic Beach, North Carolina. There are many good reasons that are logical, equitable and economically sound for establishing a winter and spring fisheries for bluefin tuna in North Carolina or by making quota available in those months.

I hope my fellow travelers from North Carolina cover these. But I want to tell you why I am willing to spend 20 hours on a bus. It's personal to me. I don't know how many of you have read Hemingway's To Have and Have Not, or remember it if you have. It's a tale about a scoundrel who smuggles aliens and rum, gets him arm shot off in a gun battle with the Coast Guard, finally dying as a result of an aborted bank robbery. All this because he's trying to earn enough to keep his charter boat business afloat.

Hemingway contrasts Captain Morgan's life against the artists and writers in the Keys.

And the only conclusion you can make is that while not admirable, Harry Morgan at least lives his life as a man and keeps his boat till the end. Well, that's kind of like my life. I make payments on my house and my truck, but I own my boat. I've got 25 years of work tied up in her. I've got to work till

I die, and I've seen a lot of old captains working their boats long past government retirement age.

Bluefin tuna swim in the waters I fish in the fall, spring and winter. Bluefin tuna can be sold for cash money or fished on charters. Through a discriminatory policy, the National Marine Fisheries Service is regulating me out of the fisheries. By not distributing the quota throughout the year, NMFS is denying me my right to make a living. I'm mad. I won't quit. And I demand my fair share.

It seems to me that this country was founded on the idea of fair play. And I'm calling on you guys on the Advisory Panel to do what's right. And that is to put equitable bluefin tuna quota in the winter and spring months. Thank you.

BRITTON SHACKELFORD: My name is

Britton Shackelford. I'm a commercial fishermen and

I run a charter boat out of Oregon Inlet Fishing

Center. For a matter of the record, I am here to

represent the Oregon Inlet Fishing Center Guide's

Association and also our commercial hook and liners.

There are a couple of things I was involved in the bluefin fishery issue at the

inception, I guess, a couple years ago when a handful of us got together and saw what it had done for our area, the things and avenues that it opened up for us economically. And one of the most contentious issues to me is our impotence when we go to ICCAT. All of us here are for the same thing. It's to try to sit down and work out a deal that's going to be the best for everybody. But it is not going to be to the best of everybody's interest until we have our government's backing, when we go and sit down with nations that scoff at first the science and then the regulation that we try to get them to abide by, when our fishermen have been the most regulated fishermen in the world for a number of years.

It goes through me like a double-edged sword. It's extremely upsetting to me to see work that Rich and his group, Nelson, to see what our politicians and our group that has been involved in fisheries issues for years and years go through every day. Pete is getting a taste of it now.

And that first and foremost is one of our predominant issues. I would like to go down on record as saying that. We're here to get a formal

allocation so that we can put something in writing that we can depend on, that we can look forward to, but I want to go down on record as saying that we're fully committed to pressing our delegates, Congressmen, and any other elected official that need be, to back up our people when they go to ICCAT and sit down and work it out.

It's ridiculous that our fishermen have borne the brunt of regulation for the number of years that they have, and to see other countries that absolutely adhere to nothing. It's all you can catch.

Now I would like to say what it is that the Oregon Inlet Guides' Association, which represents 75 vessels, that are charter boats, not counting the number of boats that are full-time commercial hook fishermen. Length of season. We want a January, February and March fishery for a couple of reasons. It's going to eliminate any shipping problems that are associated with holidays. Traditionally, the guys in the northeast have seen it, we've seen it. In the past couple of years that we've been able to get some quota. It's going to eliminate

the Christmas, it's going to eliminate the first of January. It's going to put American fish in a market that has traditionally not been -- has not had American fish available to it. That is going to open up January, February and March. That's three months of the year.

It is going to prolong the season for dealers and for buyers and for fishermen. Whether they're fishermen from the northeast who'd rather come someplace a little bit warmer, or fishermen in the Southeast who are having a hard time making ends meet due to other regulations.

Rich, I understand what goes on. I get National Fishermen. I get a variety of publications from up north. My family's been in the seafood business for over 300 years. I understand, trust me. For the last -- up until I bought my boat, I was a monk fisherman and a dog fisherman. Believe it or not, we catch monks and we catch dogs in North Carolina. As all of you all know, we're no longer allowed to do so, as we are so many other fisheries.

One of the other issues by starting at January 1st, it's going to allow our larger fish

to get here. It's going to allow for a bigger fish, which the market is looking for, and it is going to allow for a fish that has a higher fat count that's in better shape that's going to command the highest dollar. And that's what it's all about, the most economically viable fish that we can possibly catch.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And one of the other issues that we stand on, the science that has been generated on these bluefins, I dare say that there are very few other species in the ocean that have had as much science generated regarding breeding habits, travel patterns, eating patterns, as bluefin fish have -and this amount of scientific study has come about in a very short period of time by opening our season January the 1st, it is going to allow us an active six-week tagging program which is going to be from about mid November until the first of the year, where people are going to be out there actively fishing. In a vast majority of cases, a catch and release fishery, and it is going to allow -- it is going to take a market influence off of that to allow for a lot of tagging studies to continue to go on in a very important region, which is North Carolina.

New England, as you know, is not the only area that has embarked on an active tagging program. There have been a great deal of important scientific studies and a lot of information that have been generated on bluefins from North Carolina. There is a lot that goes on with bluefins that people are not even aware of right now. It is oceans of bluefins that are approximately four to

six pounds that are out there now.

You heard it from some of the guys in Morehead and it's the same out of Oregon Inlet. You go out there on the rip right now, they are just -- there are acres of small, four to six pound, seven pound bluefins that came from somewhere and are going somewhere. We don't know -- we don't have an idea where they came from, we don't know where they're going. There's no tagging study done on it now and there's no incentive to do so.

We feel in our position that we would be able to come in and help and not hinder. We're not asking for half the quota. We are only asking for a small -- what we feel equitable share of what is available. And we feel that we can sit down in a gentlemen and ladies way and work it out so that it

1 is fair to all.

The other avenues that are open have a very strong possibility there. That is not what we would like to do. We would like to sit down. We would like to work it out so that it is fair to us and it is not burdensome, increasingly burdensome, to the people who have traditionally done their best to maintain this fishery in the United States. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Joe Shute.

JOE SHUTE: My name is Captain Joe Shute and I appreciate you all listening to us this evening. I know you're probably tired of listening to people from North Carolina right now, but after a 12-hour bus ride, I'm going to say something.

A lot of it has been covered.

Something I read in the papers that everybody's talking about here is the phrase always comes up to help achieve optimum yield for the bluefin tuna fisheries. Something else I don't quite understand, and I think that National Marine Fisheries has set this, I don't think ICCAT has, is why are we only able to fish on these fish seven months out of the

year instead of a 12-month season?

Listened to Mr. Ruais a little while ago. No significant catch in the early season, maximum yield for the amount of caught fish. Right now, starting January 1 in North Carolina, the highest quality, highest fat content fish and the closest proximity to any part of given land on the east coast goes on for January, February, March and April out of North Carolina right now.

There are no fish being hit in the market, like Shackelford said, from January from the United States. High fat content, larger fish. This means if you're worried about the stocks, you're going to be killing less fish to get your quota. You're going to be getting more money per pound for the fish, and we're going to keep a good fisheries going early part of the season when there's nothing going on. I just couldn't understand that.

Our area, I run a bait and tackle shop, charter boat and commercial fish, also. The significance of the last two years when we were left a little set-aside that was left over, it wasn't quite filled in the quota.

The economic boom to eastern North

Carolina and the southern areas down there,

December, January and February, when -- November and

December especially, when usually there's not a

whole lot going on. I mean, this made everybody's

Christmas.

This got people through the winter, made their house payments, made their boat payments. I didn't have to go to the bank to borrow money to get me through tax season. You know, hey, this was great.

And if we can guarantee that we're going to have some sort of a set-aside quota in the December, like North Carolina Marine Fisheries asked for 90 metric tons, which isn't that much, you know, this is going to get everybody through the winter.

But what I'd like to see, like
Britton was talking about, I don't understand why
the season can't open up January 1, with the
proximity of the fish that are there and the quality
of the fish that are there. That's just cutting us
out and the United States -- we got nothing against
anybody from up north down south, Florida, Oklahoma,
I don't care. If they got a commercial license to
sell fish, come on down. I mean, the fish are

there. We need to take -- to utilize what we have right there.

We need to work together with ICCAT, like was mentioned earlier. You know, United States is the one getting the short end of the stick on the ICCAT deal and everybody here knows it. I mean, it's -- we need to work together and if we do get another portion of quota, another 4 or 500 metric tons, it needs to be divvied out equally among all the states, not just North Carolina or New Jersey or wherever it needs to be divvied out equally among all the participating states.

And as far as what Rich said earlier — what Rick Ruais said earlier about going back to starting off the season with two bluefin tuna a day, there's no justification for that. If he can't fill his quota, let us start in January. We can fill the quota. They can come down and help us all so you don't have to worry about coming up short on the quota. There's plenty of fish. We're just not allowed to fish for them.

And if you go ahead and set it to where they can harvest two fish a day to start the season, if we don't get a set-aside quota or

subquota for December, you're pretty much going to cut us out of the fisheries one more time, or come close to it.

This year we did get a little bit of quota left in November. Unfortunately, we had a lot of skinny fish. They didn't bring the money that they should have. I would rather see the season open up later in December when the fat content's higher. Plus the market's already been covered. You know, two fish a day from up north coming in, the markets were pretty well saturated at that time. So, the price wasn't there that should have been in years previous. I appreciate you listening to us, and thank you for taking up your time.

BILL VANSKIVER: Only got five or six pages here, so we'll be able to go right through it.

I'm Bill Vanskiver from Morehead City. I have a charter boat, head boat permit, bluefin tuna fish out of Morehead.

Atlantic bluefin tuna are a resource of the United States. I believe properly licensed individuals should all have equal access to the resource. However, the regulations governing Atlantic bluefin tunas have discriminated against

some groups while favoring others, resulting in an unequal distribution. Pretty simple.

I joined the Winter Bluefin

Association, which is a group formed out of Morehead

City, because of its demand for equitable

distribution of Atlantic bluefin tuna to all

licensed user groups, regardless of geographical

locations. We've talked about that a lot already.

In addition to equitable opportunity
-- or equal opportunity for fishermen, it spreads
the general category allocation out so that you get
a higher yield for the dollar.

I personally have benefited from the sale of bluefin tuna. Bluefin tuna has been the biggest single winter tourism attraction to my area for four to five years now, at least. And let's see here.

We've supported scientific efforts to study and protect bluefin tuna out of North Carolina intensively. A lot of tagging been done. We tagged fish for three or four years without charters, without any monetary support, to go out there just to be involved. And we've had very few and limited opportunities to be involved in the commercial

fishery portion of that.

We take bluefin tuna seriously, and I ask that you take our demands seriously because they're sound and just. And I appreciate the opportunity to bring them to you tonight. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Were there any other members of the public that wish to speak at this time? Can I have a show of hands? All right. I guess we'll get back to the panel discussion. I don't think it would be appropriate for the panel to be grilling the public speakers, per se, but if there's a point of clarification -- again, this would be a panel discussion in hopes of providing some advice to the agency on these issues. So, start with Rich Ruais and Peter Weiss.

PETER WEISS: Thank you, Chris. I don't have any questions for Rich, but I do want to comment directly on the letter itself and preface it by saying that sometimes I get deeply embarrassed working for the industry in New England in the northeast, because of the incredible immaturity that we can display in letters like this over time, and actually distort pictures when people aren't happy

that they're getting exactly what they want.

And I'm sorry that Rich is the carrier of the news here, because -- anyways, because I know very well the two signers of the letter and I know what's going on behind the scenes and I think it's important that the Advisory Panel know a little bit about it, as well.

Number one, this suggestion that there is no representation of the harpoon category on this panel is preposterous. I represent harpoon category. I have some of the highline harpoon category members in the fishery. They are harpoon fishermen who have used airplanes, who want to use airplanes again. I have harpoon category fishermen who have used airplanes and don't want to use airplanes again.

And just so you'll know, because I know a lot of this word is going to get back, they're names like Eric Hess, one of the top producers in the category consistently, Dave Linney, Lexie Krauss, Steve Weiner, Percy Stevens, Mike Perenno, all longstanding harpooners who I have their full faith and confidence in. They join East Coast Tuna each year. They give us much assessment

money in support of the effort that we're doing, and I think they recognize that everybody in the harpoon category benefits from the work of East Coast Tuna.

The second point I wanted to make is under the harpoon category quota here, they make the reference, which is just an attempt to embarrass us further, that the in-season allocation that went to the harpoon category last year just simply came from NMFS. It doesn't work that way generally. Someone has to ask NMFS for it, and somebody has to do an incredible amount of work to get it done. And that was East Coast Tuna that got the work done to get the harpoon category and all of its participants some extra quota last year, as it was well-deserved.

The section on the purse seine fishery is particularly immature. That's the tit for tat. The purse seine fishermen, the five boats, the captains, made a conscious decision to stay out of the airplane fight because it's a general category and a harpoon category issue. It's not their business to be engaged in that. They stayed out of it. The people that lost on the battle, at least temporarily, are very angry at them.

So, what you see in there, their

opposition to moving the season back a little bit, is a flimsy, poor, attempt at justifying not opening that fishery when it's very clear that if you're trying to jam 250 tons in a 60-day fishery, that you can have smarter marketing opportunities. If you take 90 days to catch that and dribble it in in smaller quantities rather than being forced into competing when the general category and the harpoon category are in their major season right now.

That's what's happened in this fishery. The fishery has shifted to September and October in New England. And there was a time when the purse seine category -- you didn't want them operating in the early part of the season, because the general category was big in June and July. And now we're forcing the purse seine category to get right in on top of the peak season in the general category.

The reasons why it was originally August 15th have now shifted back to make -- such that the fishery should open earlier for the exact same reasons why it was made August 15th.

I'm going to -- I wanted to say some things about the North Carolina aspect in here, but

I'm just going to leave it for now. But be wary. There's strategy in this letter, it's written by a crafty lawyer, and there are strategic reasons for the whole letter, obviously.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, I'd like to address this North Carolina issue. You know, it's interesting, ICCAT -- one of the biggest problems we have at ICCAT today I think coming up is the fact that countries want quota. And we don't know how to handle it really. And although I believe that the United States policy is going to be nobody's going to get any quota increase or get any -- countries are not going to get quota who don't have quota, until the general quota of that area is increased, whether it be the west or the east. I believe that's what we're looking at.

And it's interesting now that North

Carolina wants quota, except it's not coming from

another country. It's coming from us or from fellow

Americans.

I understand the North Carolina problem completely, and I don't even disagree with parts of it. I disagree a little bit with the timing. You make it sound in North Carolina like

your fishermen are being deprived of a living, and they could very well be. But I think you forget that the New England fishermen, who have been fishing this fishery for 20 years up there, under strict quotas, and a lot of them who make their living from bluefin tuna fishing, and a lot of them who are moving into this fishery from other fisheries that are being closed up around them, as they are in North Carolina, are going to be deprived if you get your 90 tons or 15 percent of their quota, just like that.

We have 7,000 permitted holders, I guess. 15 percent of 7,000, I believe, is 1,050. Are there 1,050 permitted holders in North Carolina? Maybe there are. I don't know. I would doubt it. But there possibly could be. But that's the figures that are in New England. There are 7,000 permitted holders. We have 1,000 people -- approximately 1,000 people that caught fish last year. It's a very big fishery.

And for that fishery to lose 90 tons, 15 percent of its quota, would be a very dramatic loss. I said I understand your problem, and it's nice to hear that you're willing to work with us, to

work with Rich, to work with Glenn, in trying to get more support for ICCAT. I'm really sorry to hear that you didn't do it before. Because you did have a fishery down there and you do have a fishery down there. It may not be a big general category fishery, but it was a big angling fishery. And I think it's a profitable enterprise from all I understand, although I've never been down there.

And it's really appreciated the fact that you're going to get some of your Congressmen to work with us. Hopefully, they'll be more effective than some of our Congressmen in this issue, because we've had a tough time. But I'm just sorry to hear that it took you -- it takes your wanting of 90 tons to become involved. Because I think you're going to get your 90 tons someday, or your 50 tons or maybe more. But I think that day is going to come -- personally I hope that you can see that it's going to come when we get more quota, which could very well be this coming year when we have the assessment.

You know, I've been involved in a lot of fights in this industry and a lot of times I've been accused, you know, of we're fighting among each

other, and so on and so forth, and Rich and I have had plenty of fights, although these days we don't have that many really. And personally I am not looking for a fight with North Carolina.

I understand fully why you guys want a fishery down there. I understand fully it's a money making proposition and you have every -- probably have every right to a fishery. But I think you have to wait a little bit so you don't hurt the guys up north who have had this fishery for a lot of years and who depend on this fishery, some of them completely. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:

(Inaudible) from North Carolina. I recall that we had a discussion on obviously the same issue with respect to a North Carolina general category fishery back in our 1998 Advisory Panel meeting in Baltimore.

And as was already pointed out by

Louis Daniel earlier in this meeting here, there was
a question that came up at that meeting about the

moratorium on licenses to sell, what is the

procedure and what is the cost? Maybe if you're not
familiar with it -- somebody else from North

Carolina, but my understanding is that it's generally available to all comers, so to speak?

There's a differential fee, perhaps, for out of state or nonresident license, but that's no longer an issue? Just to be clear on that.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's no longer an issue in terms of there being a moratorium. The license is referred to in the statute as a license to land and sell product that is caught by vessels of any state's registry, as long as what they're landing in North Carolina has been harvested from the EEZ.

The cost of the license is set at a minimum of \$200 and varies according to reciprocal agreements that we have with other states and according to what our fishermen are charged for the opportunity to fish in those other states with which we have reciprocal agreements. And there's a wide range of what those charges are.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: A point of clarification?

RICHARD RUAIS: I did discuss this in Morehead City and I think I was provided with information that suggested that the reciprocity with

Massachusetts, for example, puts it up to about \$1,160, Louis, if I'm not mistaken? And that's not reciprocity. Any out of state resident in Massachusetts can get a permit for \$260 to land bluefin or any other fish in Massachusetts. So, there is a continuing problem there. It's \$1,160 for an out of state person to fish bluefin in North Carolina, and it's \$260 in Massachusetts, for a boat up to 60 feet. For a boat 60 to 99 feet it's \$390.

UNIDENTIFIED: Chris, point of clarification on that, if I may? We generated these numbers out of our licensing section just a few days before coming down here, Rich, and I was surprised by the cost of some of these license and the fact that there's some odd numbers there, and I haven't had a chance to look into how those fees were set in our database, and I'll be glad to do that based on what you just said.

ROM WHITAKER: Okay. I'm just going to respond to a few comments, and the first one is the comment that Mr. Kramer brought up from North Carolina. And it is in regards to the public hearing. And I'm going to read you an e-mail that I received on March 21st. And this was after a call

to Othell concerning an agenda and public hearing and I would like to know if it was going to be as last year's, which was Tuesday night, and she was very kind and always has been in trying to get me the right information.

But anyway, my e-mail on March 21st says Rom -- this is from Ron Rinaldo. I can't get through on your phone -- I'm not sure why, but my charter customers do, but anyway -- but I wanted to tell you that we will not be holding a public hearing during the AP. We did not get the proposed rules done in time. If you want to consider an informal hearing, you might suggest it the first thing Monday morning when the agenda topics are considered.

Of course, some -- I think I fished the next Monday. That was a -- I think I didn't even get this till -- I didn't read it till Friday, but they got on the phone Monday and we were able to get -- find out when we were going to have public hearing.

But this I think is -- we need to do a little better job. I mean, if we're going to have public hearing, we got to let people know more than

two or three days in advance whether you are or you aren't. We just need to do a better job with that.

And it was a very valid point and I think that's one reason why more guys didn't show up tonight.

My second two comments were in regards to the big pie. I mean, the recreational community found it fit, for whatever reason, to give us some allocation in the southern region to continue a fishery that was very important to us, and I thank them all for that. So, it has happened.

And my third comment was in regards to the angling commercial -- or general category. It is available. You know? You might not take advantage of it, but it is available up north. So, we're just asking to be treated fairly.

GLENN DELANEY: Thank you. I would like to address two questions to the presenter. I believe his name is Rich of the Atlantic Commercial Fishermen's Alliance. Could I ask him to come back up?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Again, what we want is a discussion amongst the panel members. If there's a particular concern about some factual presentation --

	82
1	GLENN DELANEY: (Inaudible.)
2	MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: All
3	right. But our intent is not to use the panel to
4	grill members of the public
5	GLENN DELANEY: I really don't want
6	to get into an argument with you about this, but no
7	one in this room speaks with impunity. Okay?
8	Neither should the public. All right? If they have
9	said something that deserves a question, I think I
10	have a right to ask a question.
11	MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:
12	Certainly if you have a question in terms of
13	clarification, but with respect to debating the
14	issue
15	GLENN DELANEY: It's a major
16	clarification.
17	MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: is
18	what we expect the panel to do.
19	GLENN DELANEY: Thank you. Could I
20	address a question to the
21	MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Rich,
22	would you like to entertain a question?
23	GLENN DELANEY: Rich, I understand
24	you're not a bad guy and you've got a tough job to

do, and I'm not picking on you at all, but I just 1 need some clarification. RICHARD BLAKENEY: I'll do the best I 3 4 can. GLENN DELANEY: Who is Bill 5 Sheparliss? 6 RICHARD BLAKENEY: Billy Sheparliss 7 is the president of our association. He's been a 8 long-time fisherman -- tuna fisherman, started 20 9 10 some odd years ago. He's been very active in tuna 11 research, was one of the prime developers of the 12 pop-up tags that Molly -- I never can pronounce her 13 last name -- from the --GLENN DELANEY: (Inaudible.) 14 15 RICHARD BLAKENEY: Well, would you 16 like to let me finish, so I can clarify completely 17 to the panel? 18 GLENN DELANEY: I was helping you 19 pronounce her name. 20 RICHARD BLAKENEY: Oh, okay. Sorry. I'm a logger. Chain saw ears. You know, I can't 21 22 hear very well. And anyway, so Bill has been very 23 active in research and tagging programs and has a 24 lot of history and very active with the research and 1 the conservation and the harvesting of bluefin tuna.

GLENN DELANEY: I appreciate that.

I'm actually pretty familiar with him, but I wanted to get that out on the record and clarify that he is the president of this organization and therefore this represents his position on the various issues.

RICHARD BLAKENEY: Absolutely.

GLENN DELANEY: I'm also very familiar with his participation in the research with Molly, as I have been very active in that myself. Are you aware of the fact on March 25th I convened a meeting in Gloucester at the NMFS facility in Gloucester, Massachusetts, to discuss that very research program, and to basically get the industry leaders together, which I consider Billy one, to discuss how best to achieve the objective of the New England Aquarium of deploying 100 satellite, pop-up archival tags this upcoming fishing season?

RICHARD BLAKENEY: I'm fully aware of the meeting that you had. I am not privy to what happened at that meeting. Bill, one reason he is not here tonight, came down with a very bad case of the flu. He has been bedridden. And when I talked with him -- Friday was the last time I spoke with

him -- he could hardly speak on the phone, and the plan is for him to report to our association on what was at your meeting. I have no idea what was spoken at the meeting.

Bill has not -- I mean, I guess he has talked to our Executive Director, Bill Henshey, about it. But I know nothing about what transpired. I know the meeting happened. I know you're trying to get the research back going because of certain failures that happened last season between the -- you know, the lack of troll fish for the troll guys to do and attempts by the seiners to do it, that for one reason or another, you know, was not successful.

So, I know that you've contacted
Billy and we're trying to get everyone together
because our ultimate goal is to -- you know, find
out all we can about bluefin tuna to make it better
for all the United States fishermen. And you know,
develop ammunition to fight ICCAT. The more
ammunition we get, the better chance we have at
defeating the European Union.

GLENN DELANEY: Couldn't have said it better myself. And a couple of the decisions that were taken or agreements or understandings that

were reached in that meeting, which included representatives of the purse seine category, the harpoon category, and the general category, was to pursue sort of a research tagging plan for this upcoming season, which included two things that I will note.

It included other things, but two of the things I want to note was one, an agreement by people in the room who are stridently opposed to the use of aircraft in the harpoon and general categories, but yet who were willing to explore the use of a plane for the purposes of deploying tags, working perhaps with two or three vessels on a very limited basis to get out maybe 10 or 20 or so tags. And I congratulated those people in the industry to come together and understand that the research was a priority, and that they could set aside their concerns about the aircraft and move beyond that and see the value of the research, just like Billy does.

Another thing that was agreed to or discussed without objection in that meeting was to provide for an early opening of the purse seine vessels on July 15th together with the possibility of a two-week -- approximately two-week experimental

permit or special permit which would allow just the tagging activity to occur prior to July 15th and that the fishery would then commence on July 15th.

This was discussed for several hours at this meeting with Billy, at which time no objection to the concept was ever raised. This was a week and a day ago that I had this conversation. I organized this meeting on my own dime and came up there and -- trying to promote the research. And one week and one day later, I'm confronted with a paper by the president of the association, the very same person I discussed this with, taking the opposite position.

So, I hope that Billy feels better soon and that you'll get a chance to talk to him on the phone and that he'll get a chance to report on the meeting of a week and a day ago, at which time he raised absolutely no objection and understood how the purse seine tagging was going to represent probably 60 percent of our objective. This is not some small part of our program, but a huge part of - the greatest part of our program was going to be accomplished by one purse seiner who has made himself available for this purpose. And we

discussed at great length the July 15th opening date, and with no objection raised whatsover. So, I bring that to your attention and ask you to discuss that and perhaps provide this -- provide me with some clarification, if not the AP.

The second issue I want to address to you is this discussion at the very end where the author, which I presume is Bill Henshey, has actually suggested that the harpoon swordfishermen in New England did not have adequate notice of the availability of swordfish limited access hand gear permits, which many of us in this room find to be a rather remarkable statement, considering that the issue is discussed and considered for years, and I believe that the comment period was -- or the availability period was even extended for an additional six months at one point.

And I think basically the threshold for qualifying to get one of those permits is if you could show up with a picture of yourself and a swordfish on the same picture, that was your catch history and you got a permit. I mean, that was the standard of -- it didn't -- you know, you could be standing on a dock next to a swordfish and you'd

have gotten a permit, if you got your picture --1 thought enough to take a picture. So, I just wanted to point that out 3 4 to the AP, that any claims of lack of due process to gain access to those permits and therefore the 5 fishery I guess from my perspective is completely 6 7 false. Thank you very much. Have I berated the witness? 8 MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: 9 10 (Inaudible.) Our hope was to have a panel 11 discussion of the issues and we don't want to be 12 putting the public on the spot, so to speak. 13 certainly if there's a factual question that needs clarification, yes, --14 15 GLENN DELANEY: I think that's what I 16 just did, and accountability is important for 17 everybody in this business. 18 RICHARD BLAKENEY: Anybody else before I leave? 19 20 UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible.) MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: 21 All 22 right. Let's --23 GLENN DELANEY: Chris, I've got two

issues to address to the panel now. Switching to

24

bluefin tuna, if I might do that. Or North
Carolina, I'm sorry.

curious.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay. Rich -- the witness may be excused.

RICHARD BLAKENEY: Okay. Thank you.

GLENN DELANEY: Curious. I could address this to the -- I think it's probably -- you guys are very competent in discussing and advocating your positions, so I don't know that I need to torment anybody in the back of the room, but just curious how was the 90-ton figure selected? Was that based on some analysis of some sort? Just

Whoever wants to --

UNIDENTIFIED: Toss-up question.

QUIDENTIFIED: It is a toss-up question and I think it's looking more at a percentage basis. It's approximately eight percent. Looking at the time period and we hope to have this fishery available ultimately -- I think we're -- it's been suggested to us to look at this incrementally. We're looking at it incrementally. We've obviously like to see these fish available in January and February. We'd like to have clarification at some point as to why there's no

allowable sale in January and February when the market is the most lucrative.

But the 90 metric tons we felt was a reasonable amount. To be perfectly frank, we felt that it looked a lot better than 100. And it would tend to keep the fishery going for the entire month of December, based on the catch histories that we've seen in 2000 and 2001, when we had between 30 and 40 available during that time period. No scientific basis for developing 90.

GLENN DELANEY: Just as a point of clarification, I believe 90 tons would probably actually represent something more like 15 percent of the U.S. quota, not --

UNIDENTIFIED: I'm sorry. I was talking eight percent of the 1114 total commercial quota, not general category. You're right. IT would be higher than eight percent of just the general category.

GLENN DELANEY: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir.

on, a couple of other quick questions. Actually, you raised a point that I had forgotten about. You

might want to -- I don't know what pricing experience you've had this winter -- I don't know if any fish have been sold out of North Carolina. I apologize for not knowing that.

UNIDENTIFIED: No, that information wasn't available on the fisheries economic web site at the time.

GLENN DELANEY: Just so -- you might want to look at that situation, whereas in the past certainly the lack of U.S. production during the winter months has meant the possibility for good prices in Tokyo. However, in this past year, we have been absolutely inundated -- we, I should say Tokyo and the bluefin global market has been inundated with bluefin tuna being extracted from the pens in the Mediterranean, and I was wondering if you saw the effect of that. Because, you know, I've eating torro all winter long and that's where it's coming out of is the pens off of Spain and Italy.

So, I'm not certain that the price structure that you're anticipating exists today any longer, or will exist ever for the future because of the massive amount of fish that's ended up in the traps. But that's another ICCAT challenge that we

1 face.

Another question was how many tons are in the angling category for North Carolina? I heard a couple of numbers thrown around, and is that a fixed number or is that something that just sort of is ad hoc?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:

There's a northern and southern subdivision of the angling category quota. The dividing line, if you recall, last year was moved from basically Delaware South New Jersey north to include the Cape May County fishery in the southern zone, because they do tend to fish in the same area as the Maryland, Delaware and some of the Virginia vessels in the southern zone.

So, there's no quota defined for the North Carolina fishery with respect to that. It's just part of the southern portion of the angling category quota.

GLENN DELANEY: But in effect, those tons are fished by the north -- primarily off the coast of North Carolina, is that --

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, again, it's a shared quota. So, North Carolina

takes a portion of that -- a lot of the small medium fish that are landed in that category are taken in North Carolina, basically from December right on into late March or early April.

GLENN DELANEY: And roughly how many tons are we talking about?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Do you have -- actually from the catch cards --

UNIDENTIFIED: Last few years it's averaged between 40 and 50 tons.

GLENN DELANEY: Okay. I heard one of your fishermen -- thank you very much -- say earlier, which was a thought that occurred to me, also, which was -- you know, gee, if we could sell them we would. There would be no angling recreational fishery off North Carolina. I wonder if you've thought about the possibility of looking at those 40 or 50 tons and making them available for sale rather than extracting them from other segments of the industry outside of your region? Anybody want to take a stab at that?

UNIDENTIFIED: Well, I mean, if you look at the -- I mean, arguably, North Carolina has the best recreational data collection system on the

95 east coast, and has a very accurate counting 1 mechanism in place. And the fish that are available 3 to the angling category are -- the size classes befuddle me, but they're 59 to 73-inch fish. 4 about 90 percent of the North Carolina catch, or 5 39.6 metric tons, was in that little -- what Rich 6 7 calls the slot size fish. GLENN DELANEY: I understand that. 8 UNIDENTIFIED: And so very few fish 9 10 over 73 inches are landed by the recreational 11 fishery. 12 GLENN DELANEY: I understand that. 13 But what I'm talking about is just tons, fungible tons that could potentially be changed from angling 14 15 category to the general category by NMFS, if that 16 was the will of North Carolina, since they are 17 fishing -- you know, landing 40 or 50 tons of

bluefin tuna in the angling category, perhaps as 40 or 50 tons could be landed as general category and address a substantial part of your need.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible.)

GLENN DELANEY: Please. It's an open

discussion.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This goes back a ways. UNIDENTIFIED:

1993 we started catching the tunas. I run a charter boat. We never -- traditionally, people call me way in advance, June, July, August to book charters January through March to go catch a giant bluefin or have the opportunity to catch and release or catch and keep one a day a large medium or small medium.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, from I guess almost ten years now -- of course I've built up a pretty good wintertime business, people coming to catch a fish, and -- you know, we haven't been even anytime here in the last -- after January 1st it shuts down, you know? you're basically out of -- we're out of availability to do anything. You know, I have booked those charters, worked hard to build up that business, and that's very important to me personally is to have that business for the 50 metric tons or whatever it I mean, we're talking about one fish a day that we would take for our charter. Sometimes they may come for two days or three days and only take one fish. But they still want the opportunity to take that one fish. So, I think hopefully that will help answer some of your questions.

GLENN DELANEY: So, what you're saying is North Carolina wouldn't necessarily be

ı	9.7
1	interested in sacrificing their angling category
2	fishery so that there could be developed a
3	commercial general category fishery. They'd rather
4	have somebody else make that sacrifice.
5	UNIDENTIFIED: If you're asking me
6	that question.
7	GLENN DELANEY: Yeah.
8	UNIDENTIFIED: I don't think for the
9	time and effort I have put in this that I would want
10	to give up my recreational business. If you're
11	asking me
12	GLENN DELANEY: I totally understand.
13	So does everybody else
14	UNIDENTIFIED: if I had
15	opportunity I might say yeah, you let me catch three
16	fish that I can sell and I'll you know, maybe do
17	away with the other. But I've worked hard to get
18	that and I certainly don't want to lose it.
19	GLENN DELANEY: I think most of us
20	got my point. I'll move on to the next question.
21	UNIDENTIFIED: Chris, could I respond
22	to that. As a major manager of fisheries in North
23	Carolina, I would like to say that
24	MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Just a

point of clarification. We did agree that we were
going to curtail the discussion at 10 o'clock so
people could get some sleep tonight. We got
basically 50 minutes left, and a large number of
folks who still want to speak haven't had a chance.
So, maybe if Glenn could conclude his --

GLENN DELANEY: I'm ready to conclude. I have one more point to make, but I don't want to cut off, because it's probably an important point.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Do you want to respond to his last --

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible.)

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well, you're still on the list, unless you want to respond directly.

UNIDENTIFIED: Well, that may be the case for me, but that's not necessarily the case for these guys that came up here tonight and spent a lot of time and effort wanting a fish to sell. And so I'm speaking for myself. At this particular -- that particular question to me, I'm not speaking for them. I think that they need to have the opportunity to sell a fish, if that's important to

them.

GLENN DELANEY: Very good.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Let's

let the panel discuss that point a little bit.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman, and my comments will be brief. I only wanted to make the point that perhaps that's an option that we should not foreclose tonight and pursue internally in North Carolina in the future. Realistically, I would expect as strong if not a stronger battle and resistance from the group that's interested in maintaining their recreational quota as we are receiving tonight from the New England contingent in protecting their general category quota. But it's an honest question that we probably need to consider very carefully.

The problem or I think one of the most important points is though, is that we have parity in the recreational category with other states, and we don't feel like we need to sacrifice that parity to gain an equal opportunity or a fair opportunity in the general category, which according to our interpretation of the Magnuson Act, is provided for us.

GLENN DELANEY: It was an honest question and I think the pain that you would suffer in pursuing that internally within the North Carolina fishery is exactly the pain that you're asking someone else in another fishery to bear. I'm just trying to point that out, that -- you know, fully perceive that that's what you're asking someone to do. It's a zero sum game here this year. It may not be a zero sum game when we come back from ICCAT in November, but right now it's a zero sum game. Somebody has to feel that pain.

UNIDENTIFIED: I live with pain every day. There's not enough Ibuprofen in this room to put aside what's awakened in me when I go to work, but it's an honest question.

GLENN DELANEY: Talking about pain,
I've been involved with ICCAT since 1982 in one
capacity or another, and I have been an observer of
the U.S. bluefin tuna industry throughout this
rather torturous process that started in '82 when we
changed the entire management of the fishery. And
ever since that day, I've been watching that
industry try to change it back to what they perceive
as reality, and which science is now proving them

right.

I will just point out as having been a close observer of this for the past 20 or 21 years that there is a lot of blood on the bluefin tuna floor. And frankly, you know, I could go into a lot of reasons for that blood, but I would point out that perhaps the only reason we even have a commercial bluefin tuna fishery, or recreational for that matter, are the very people that you're asking to give up 15 percent of their living.

It wasn't very long ago that some people in this room right now were advocating -- I think they're still here -- maybe one has left -- were advocating that the bluefin tuna be listed as an Endangered Species under the Endangered Species Act. That's how far we've come in the last eight, nine years, in our efforts to sustain a fishery in the United States.

So, the history of what I think Rich and some of the others were trying to convey to you is a very, very powerful consideration in all of this. And so I would not -- I know you don't take it lightly at all, but I ask you to take it extremely seriously and understand what these people

have been through and what they fought for and how much they put into this and how difficult it's been to maintain even what we have today. And that's just on the domestic side. The efforts that have gone into the international side have been also extraordinary.

And I will last say that Peter Weiss really brought up the key point, which was timing. We are on the verge of having the fruits of 20 years of labor by the northeast general category industry primarily together with the purse seiners and harpooners, those fruits finally realized at ICCAT by perhaps having an opportunity to increase the overall TAC in the western Atlantic, which the United States would get -- you know, a predominant share of, 57, 8 percent, I think -- 52 percent, and provide substantial opportunities for fisheries in the United States that we haven't had for 21 years.

So, the timing issue is not a small thing, and I got a sense from what I heard from Rich and others say is that we can work this out, maybe not this summer, but if there's an ability for everybody to sort of step back and look at the big picture, there may be a wonderful opportunity for us

all to take advantage of those 20 years of efforts to finally get an increase in the quota.

Wanted to go back to my earlier comment and apologize to Rich, because I felt like that I should thank him for the effort -- the working with us, answering our phone calls, coming to see us, and helping educate us on this issue, Rich, and I hope you understand that we do deeply appreciate that. And appreciate your time and your effort from yourself and your organization.

A second thing I wanted to do was to thank the people from North Carolina that came up here tonight to give public testimony. I realize it's their livelihood and they're deeply concerned, but for them to take time away from their job to ride on that bus and come all the way up here, I just wanted to publicly thank those people and tell them we really appreciate it.

And the last comment I wanted to make was -- I mean, Glenn making a point about timing and those issues are difficult, but under the general category permit, if I understand it, you could walk in tomorrow and buy a general permit and go out and

fish for bluefin tuna up in the northeast region.

And if that's true, then you know, it's difficult for us I guess to kind of understand if that is allowable process why then our fishermen can't join in and be able to harvest or have this quota that we're talking about. And I'm not just talking about for North Carolina. I'm talking about this -- what we call our subregion. Thank you.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. I have a different perspective on the history of this fishery. And as you well know, New Jersey was at one time the bluefin -- giant bluefin capital of the world, so they said. I mean, the trap fishermen, they were catching them there. first Atlantic bluefin tuna tournaments were held I caught my first giant bluefin in 1965, and that was before the NMFS management regime. mean, we have a long history, but fisheries change. We don't have that fishery anymore. We don't have it in the mudhole. A few fish show up every year and because of maybe warming ocean currents, etcetera, the bottom's warmer, the whiting are not there anymore, there's no forage for them, the fish are moving.

1

∠ 3

4

5

_

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

law.

21

22

23

24

And I think the Magnuson Act was put together in the spirit of knowing that there you have delegations from all different states that sit on these resources committees, and they put it together to give opportunity for fishermen up and down the coast. And in that spirit, we are behind. And I have members here from North Carolina that came up here today. They are members of the RFA. They fish in general category, they fish in charter They use recreational gear. They buy pen 130 internationals from Betty Hensey and her family in Philadelphia, U.S. made. They buy other tackle, which is sportfishing equipment. This is good. socioeconomic benefits of spreading this fishery up and down the coast is a benefit to our industry. And I don't care that they sell the fish. doesn't mean anything. They're catching it on good gear, as far as I'm concerned. It's a rod and reel. And they're catching within the quota, within the

I think it's good. We support it.

The RFA is behind getting -- how you guys work your markets out, that's your own -- I mean, I don't know anything about the market. That's something you

need to do yourself. But I think giving them their equitable share of a fishery, where we've shown that we're willing to work with them on the angling category and get that fishery going, and we don't want to give up angling fish in the southern zone and convert them into sellable fish. That's a separate fishery.

And you know, let's try to give these people their due fishery under the National Standards that were created with a consensus by many delegates of our Congressional delegation on both houses. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Very briefly. It seems to me that the real substantive issue that's the most important in North Carolina is some certainty that there will be fish available. I understand the problems that we have with the quota and the problems that we have splitting it up, and I would suggest that at the very least if there was some certainty that they might continue to get all or some portion of the fish that serendipitously have come their way in the last year or so that might be a place to start, at least some portion of that.

on the bus have left, but I wanted to thank them, too. I wanted to thank Jerry Schill for coming up from the North Carolina Fisheries Association. And my first comment is to Mr. Weiss. The North Carolina delegation has helped with ICCAT problems, especially -- I know for sure the ones I have voted for have worked very hard, and I think some of your ICCAT appointees would verify that.

Mr. Blakely made a statement that he switched from the harpoon to the general category, and I wanted to ask him was that possible for him to do that. I guess you can answer that question for me.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Not within a single fishing year. Basically your permit category is determined for the fishing year. But from one year to the next, you can change categories. Unless he was referring to the fact that you can use harpoon gear or rod and reel gear with a general category permit.

what -- because I knew that you had taken the right
-- or the right from the longline incidental

category to switch to the general had been taken from them. But is not possible to switch from the 3 harpoon category and fish under a general category 4 only with a harpoon, is that --

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible.)

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Both gear types are authorized within the general category. General category hand line, rod and reel, harpoon. Harpoon category obviously is dedicated for harpoon gear.

WILLIAM ETHERIDGE: Chris, a question for you is when a person receives a general category permit, what does that entitle them to do?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: respect to bluefin tuna, they are restricted to fish 73 inches and above. It doesn't require that they be sold, but they are eligible to be sold. With respect to yellowfin tuna, they do not have the three per person limit that applies to the recreational fishery, because that's considered a commercial permit, provided you abide by the minimum size for yellowfin bigeye, there's no catch limit, and it's sold to a licensed dealer.

WILLIAM ETHERIDGE: Is it a time

restriction on when they can fish?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: For bluefin tuna, yes. It's highly structured with respect to subquotas, monthly quotas, restricted fishing days. Again, this regime was put in place so that the fishery would be spread out over time, as opposed to geographic subdivisions. The intent was to allow the fishery to be conducted throughout the migratory range of the fishery by slowing down the catch rates and spreading out the fishing opportunities across the season.

WILLIAM ETHERIDGE: Okay. It might have been before your time, but why was the season started on the 1st of June for bluefin tuna?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: It was before my time, but luckily I have access to old Federal Register Notices. It was established at the 1st of June because of the ICCAT recommendation on the no directed fishery in the spawning area, and it was presumed that all fish would be outside of the Gulf of Mexico at that point in time, by June 1st.

WILLIAM ETHERIDGE: So, it was done for spawning purposes. Does the science still show that that's why it should be open? I mean, is there

	110	
1	any reason now to not open it the 1st of January?	
2	MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Well,	
3	there's	
4	WILLIAM ETHERIDGE: Has the science	
5	changed?	
6	MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:	
7	certainly other means of ensuring that there's no	
8	directed fishery in the spawning area. If it was	
9	determined that there was spawning off of North	
10	Carolina, that would be another issue. But	
11	presuming that the only viable spawning area, at	
12	least known at this time, is in the Gulf of Mexico,	
13	on this side of the ocean, that you could preclude	
14	directed fishery from occurring in the Gulf of	
15	Mexico while still allowing it to occur outside the	
16	Gulf of Mexico.	
17	WILLIAM ETHERIDGE: Can a person with	
18	a general category permit catch a tuna in the Gulf	
19	when the season is open?	
20	MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: No.	
21	There's no directed fishery. A general category	
22	permit is considered directing on bluefin tuna.	
23	WILLIAM ETHERIDGE: So, I'd just like	
24	to ask Rich or Peter Weiss a question. What kind of	

effect would it have on your fishermen if a season
the members of your association or organization,

if the season was to open the first of January?

Your members, the people that support your group.

mean, Willie, if the general category opened on

January 1? I guess it would depend upon how much

quota was available at that point in time and how

much was caught between then and the time that the

fishery ordinarily originates up in New England.

So, I don't think it's safe to make the assumption that they're all going to pack it up, and/or give up what they're currently doing at that time to move to some other location to get into the fishery at that time. That's not the traditional way they participate and they may have to give up some other opportunities, to the extent that there are other opportunities and they're engaged in them.

WILLIAM ETHERIDGE: (Inaudible) we'd have had a solution, because if it was open the 1st and there was a quota put -- if it was open on the 1st of January, it would -- you know, I mean, 1,015 or 1,000 plus permits in New England, general category permits, could fish in North Carolina.

I know that the \$1,060 or whatever it was fee is very expensive, but I just thought that -- you know, I know on the buying end, on the financial side of it, the buying end of the bluefin, I don't know of any North Carolina dealer that got to buy any of the bluefin that were caught.

So, as a fish dealer, it's not an incentive for me to -- or I can't really see any incentive for me to try to get a whole lot more fish caught down there. But to try to be fair and equitable, which we always go back to that, and it's in there, and to not do anything to take any fish from somebody else and be able to solve the problem -- if the season was open the 1st of January, everybody would have the same access to catch the fish and I just thought that it might be an easy way.

I know it wouldn't be a real popular way, but I think it would be fair and equitable, and I would hope that -- I'm sure that their two organizations probably would lose some income, because more of the fish would be caught by members that was -- or weren't a member of their organization. And I know that they gain their

financing from a percentage or a cost per pound of fish.

But fair and equitable would fit in the picture, if it was to open the 1st of January instead of the 1st of June. And I know it's not popular and I know it probably won't get me any free drinks downstairs tonight, but it would be -- you know, and I always -- every time when I get talking to the public and I hear the word fair, I always go back to that teacher I had in seventh grade and that would tell me through life I would never -- I would find out that nothing is fair. And boy, he had some premonition about me serving on this committee.

Thank you.

RICHARD RUAIS: Chris, if I could just finalize my point.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:

(Inaudible.)

RICHARD RUAIS: And I just wanted -I wanted to finish up my comment to Willie back -there would be a couple of other issues involved.

Number one, December/January would not be a good
time for the general category fleet, if you will, to
make the trip from New England somewhere south.

It's just not a great time to be doing that.

Second, most of the boats or a lot of those boats are out of the water at that time, as well. They just -- they don't stay in the water year-round. And the third thing that I just thought of quickly was in my one quick day down in Morehead City and around New Bern in what I think is the dead of your season down there, I certainly didn't see 1,000 open slips anywhere.

UNIDENTIFIED: Just to follow up on a couple comments. Do you want to finish --

There were a few other things that I wanted to say.

Louis earlier was -- I was really interested in his presentation. I thought it was really well done and professional, and I was intrigued with the historical stuff dating back to the '60s on the catches, and I just wanted to point out for him that there are records of Indians tomahawking bluefin tuna caught in tidal pools off of Maine.

So, we have a little history and there was a very active harpoon fishery throughout the 1800's for bluefin, for various reasons, some of it eating, some of it for -- and then I'm sure we

also had the dory fishermen for codfish both in the Gulf of Maine, Georges Bank and up on Grand Banks had quite a history in this fishery, as well.

And of course once in the 19th, 20th century, New England is where the fishery was -- New England and I would say New Jersey, as well. I think Jimmy's right. Some of the earliest purse seining took place in there, as well. So, a lot of different areas can make that kind of argument.

In terms of the most lucrative market, and I heard several of you commenting upon that, we've gone through that issue and that's one area where Peter and I have battled, and my members have battled over that issue. And you can always find -- try to find good arguments to do that, but typically what you find is that the highest prices come when the landings are the lowest, the point that Glenn was trying to make. And whenever you find the lowest landings, somehow they don't stay the lowest landings for very long.

And I would point out to you that this year alone there's 12,000 metric tons in the farms in the Mediterranean. And they stay out of the market a bit in October because they see the

production from New England, and New England has to

put the fish on that market because we're not in the

farming business. They hold the fish for this

November, December, January, the winter marketing,

because that's when they have more -- they at least

know that the Boston bluefin is not available.

The other thing -- you didn't understand what I was saying because I didn't make it very clear about not having two fisheries in New England. There was a time when the general category was not defined as a commercial fishery, and general category fishermen -- and I don't know the exact date. I've forgotten it. But it was sometime either in the early '90s or late 1980's when a rule came out and actually made that definition when there was a big debate going on about what is a commercial fishery or not.

And at that time, general category fishermen during that time, you could not only catch the giant, but you could get large schoolies, you could get anything down to the 15 pound ICCAT minimum size. And those fish were taken in New England.

So, the general category was a quasi-

recreational, quasi-commercial category at that time. NMFS made a determination at one point, and we didn't object to it, we didn't like losing the sale of those fish, to define the general category as commercial. So, we are -- anybody that's in the general category that can't qualify for the charter/party status, is defined as a commercial fisherman and can't have fish under 73 inches.

UNIDENTIFIED: Well, I guess my point

-- and one thing I wasn't sure about, and it would

be more of a question, but I wonder are tuna or wild

fish worth more than a pen-raised fish, and are they

like salmon? I know that sometimes a wild salmon

brings more than the pen raised.

My other couple of points is there are 3,000 charter head boat permits, and I certainly don't think those 3,000 are in North Carolina. So, there is some double-dipping going on somewhere besides North Carolina. I don't know if that's days off or what, but that was another -- in response to a comment.

And I guess the unlimited permits -- and by that I mean -- Wayne could call up tomorrow, he may already have one, and get a bluefin tuna

permit and go get involved in the fishery. And I know that's got to be frustrating to Rich and East Coast and certainly to Peter. You know, to -- I mean, here's a fishery that's only so big and you might have 10,000 new entrants in it this year. So, it's a tough -- it's a tough place. But any rate, I just wanted to point out those things. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you, Chris. Am

I the last one here in this particular -- this
segment?

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: (Inaudible) Nelson.

UNIDENTIFIED: Okay. Well, Nelson doesn't count. I'll still -- just I assume Glenn was being facetious and trying to make a point with his redistribution of the North Carolina angling category 38 metric tons or 38 percent, whatever it was, into general category fish. Because the caution there, of course -- first, they'd be crazy to do it, because they have an excellent recreational community and they have an argument, whatever the end result will be, for equity up and down the line, and that's amongst themselves. I'm not really -- you know, going to get into that.

But just remember this. Right now the angling category, as Chris pointed out, is dividing into a north/south scenario, with 52 percent to the south, now 48 to the north. And if you were to take 38 metric tons, 38 percent, whichever it is, of a segment of that southern fishery, you're not going to redistribute the northern 48 percent in half again and give it to the south so they have the continuum of an equitable 48/52.

We're going to keep our own fish in the north, if there's any conversion of the southern quota into a general category quota, just -- I mean, we'll fight like the devil about that. So, you know, forget that for a moment.

And I have to talk to poor Rich, because he was a little perturbed earlier, and I assume it's over that new organization up in New England. And there's an old saying what goes around comes around.

I heard the name Bill Henchley. Is that the same Bill Henchey who was once a member of East Coast Tuna, and has belonged to Massachusetts Audubon and had a lawsuit to close out the angling

category up and down the east coast? My God. Okay.

Well, there is a God and you don't really deserve that, Rich. You've done a good job. You tried very hard. But what the heck, I have to throw something in it. Thank you, gentlemen.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible) but the answer is Joe missed his calling. He's asked several questions here and not one of them he didn't know the answer. He should have been a lawyer.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's pretty bad when it's been around so long that some of the folks at the head of the table weren't around when things were occurring. But I don't know what the Federal Register says, but I know the primary reason that the dates were changed from January 1 to June 1 was because as ICCAT became more and more complex and taking on more and more species and issues, etcetera, it became absolutely impossible for the National Marine Fisheries Service to put out the new rules between the November Commission meeting and the January 1 start of the fishery.

We started getting into a circumstance where our fishermen were being managed under retroactive rulemaking. We would finally get

a rule out, and like June, July, you know, August, whatever, and it would change everything that had happened from January to that time. It was called retroactive rulemaking. And it wasn't working very well and it had to be changed, and businesses just simply could not operate under that circumstance. But that was the reason that it went from January 1 to June 1. And I'm sure that you probably did not put that in the Federal Register.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: That was the change in the fishing year that was done as a part of the FMP process. But prior to that time, the June 1 start date for the general category fishery was in existence. Even though the fishing year -- the fishing year was defined as beginning January 1, the angling category was open -- the incidental catch category was open as of January 1 under the calendar fishing year, but the general category season did not start -- or the harpoon category until June 1. But two separate issues there. One was the season start date, one was a fishing year account.

All right. Do we have any (inaudible) Wayne Lee and Preston Pate.

1 WAYNE LEE: I'd like to respond to 2 Rich's Indians with the tomahawk and that is that

we've started developing a new fishery down in

Hatteras this summer, and we had a recreational

angler rope a bluefin that was caught in the surf

right close to the beach. So, that's -- we're

starting a new technique down there, Rich.

UNIDENTIFIED: Is that an authorized

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible.)

gear?

WAYNE LEE: Be a new fishery. I would accept that. The other comment I wanted to make about our recreational fishery is that

Professor Robert Didden came down and did a study on the social and economic impact of a charter fishery on North Carolina, the Hatteras area. I don't remember the precise dollar figure, I think it's close to -- it was about 4 million dollar industry, and that's the fishing industry that Rom and a lot of these other people are in. So, it's a very important industry in terms of the money that it generates for our community.

PRESTON PATE: Thank you, Chris. I was hoping to have the last word. So, maybe it will

be and we can move on to something else. The last word on this issue, I should say.

I'd really like to thank everyone again for the opportunity of bringing this before the AP and the time that we've devoted has been a sacrifice for us all. I had no expectations to come here tonight or what would have been today, and find this idea to be totally embraced without debate and some level of acrimony. Nothing is that easy in our world, unfortunately, and we're always battling other interests and competing interests in most everything that we do, and that's just the nature of our business.

But this is an extremely important issue for North Carolina's fishermen and North Carolina's coastal economy, and we felt like we could not miss this opportunity to once again raise the issue with the group in the hopes that where we didn't expect consensus, we would at least get some voice of support and understanding of our needs so that when the agency goes about its business to follow this up with the annual specifications, you'll know that it's not totally an unfounded request and hopefully will satisfy our needs to some

extent. Again, thanks to everyone around the table for your comments tonight.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Have we exhausted the general category discussion? Do we need to continue for 20 minutes on potential issues for the harpoon or purse seine category? Or do you want to call it a night? I see Rich wants to speak.

RICHARD RUAIS: I don't want to buck the tide, but I don't think that I've done an adequate job yet on the purse seine question. It is very important.

Glenn made the case for research and the angle there is that we want to get the purse seine boat up to New England from July 1 to July 15th, at least to do the contract research tagging, and the vessel will need to be able, if there is any mortality, to be able to count the fish against its quota and to make it financially doable. It doesn't make sense to go back to New Jersey or anywhere else.

And this has been a -- you know, a strong -- a situation the last several years where we're crowding too much of the total commercial quota to be caught in a 60-day period. And there's

a lot less of the catch coming in right now in the - in July. And it makes sense in our view to
recognize this kind of evolution in the fishery and
have regulatory changes that respond to that.

And other times, the purse seiners would focus in on the yellowfin tuna fishery in June and July, and there's an obvious concession there to our friends in the angling community to stay away from that fishery and this would also help allowing the purse seine season to start earlier, around July 15th. It would help provide some marketing — better marketing opportunities that don't currently exist right now. And so I would like to see that in the specifications or the proposed rule when it comes out this year. And taken to public hearings and we'll be there at all the public hearings to make the case.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Looks like we have a show of hands for further discussion here. Again, we'll have a cutoff at 10 o'clock. So, I've got Joe, Jim, Glenn and Nelson. And Peter.

JOSEPH MCBRIDE: Very quickly, Rich, you're saying bring up -- I assume -- you said Jersey, you're bringing the White Dove up to do the

research. That's fine. And I assume you're going to net these fish and leave them in the water and tag them and not bring them aboard, check out the biggest ones, throw the rest, something like that. All right.

Now, what's that boat going to do for the rest of the year and what about the other purse seine boats? Do they want to start fishing in June, also? And how does -- I mean, I don't really care. It's the general category -- you know, vis-a-vis the purse seiners and the money fish, but those are questions we should ask and get an answer to, I think.

RICHARD RUAIS: Yes, the other boats want the option of taking opportunities from July 15th on --

JOSEPH MCBRIDE: All through the season?

RICHARD RUAIS: Well, from July 15 -starting the season one month earlier than has been
from August 15th to July 15th, to catch some of
their quota in that earlier month, and then
obviously continue their fishery until they're done,
as every other user group does.

1 JOSEPH MCBRIDE: All right. I know

in --

RICHARD RUAIS: I'll let Glenn talk

about --

JOSEPH MCBRIDE: -- the past there have been some conflicts at the end of the season. There used to be a complaint that the power of the purse seiners was so great up in New England when they set on the gear, and National Marine Fisheries would close the rod and reel fishery or the general category fishery so it wouldn't interfere, one with the other. But that's -- you know, either hearsay or politics or whatever.

The other thing is what are these boats going to do now? Let's say they start fishing in July 15th and there's a paucity of fish. Are they going to go back to the yellowfin in our area? We're going to have those wars of video cameras checking to see who's catching this fish and that fish and all that nonsense went on and hasn't gone on for years. That's -- and I'm speaking now specifically on behalf of the angling category.

RICHARD RUAIS: No, I believe the last time that there was any catch of yellowfin tuna

by a purse seiner was early 1990's, if I'm not
mistaken, '94, '95 maybe. And there has been a very
obvious effort -- there's an informal agreement with
RFA and others to stay out of the yellowfin tuna
fishery for as long as that agreement holds, and
mutual support exists.

So, I don't see them going back into the yellowfin tuna fishery. Three of the boats are combination tuna purse seiners and Atlantic sea scallopers, when they're done tuna fishing --

JOSEPH MCBRIDE: I was going to ask you what are they going to do. They used to be — they'd fish for the — what we call the mush mouths, what the hell they call — the actual name, the bonita — skipjacks. And you know, whether they were catching them or catching something else depending who you spoke to — you know, one of the stories of the past. We haven't seen it in a while. We really don't need that type of controversy, you know, during the summer months if we can avoid it. And you know, that would be one of the considerations.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible.)

JOSEPH MCBRIDE: (Inaudible) I'm

getting too old, though, Rich.

JAMES DONOFRIO: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. I would implore upon the agency to accommodate the purse seine industry with their changing markets and all the other things that Rich has mentioned before, so they can fully utilize their quota. And also it's a benefit -- it's a benefit to the recreational community that they utilize it, because as Rich said, we do have an informal agreement that they will stay away from the yellowfin tuna, which is really our primary tuna fishery for the recreational sector.

So, we want them to utilize the ICCAT quota to its fullest, and we'd like the agency to accommodate their needs so they can, because I know last year they did not use it. Thank you.

GLENN DELANEY: I wanted to recall some of the discussions we had up in Gloucester last week, and it seemed to me that Mike was also pointing out that one benefit of being able to start earlier would be that they could spend more of their time further offshore, away from sort of interacting in the Cape Cod Bay area in particular, which was very -- has been very, very contentious, where when

the purse seiners are pushed up against the end of the season, weather start deteriorating rapidly, they're not sure if they're going to be able to fish -- you know, for the remainder of the season.

I mean, that's how the weather can change up there, as you well know. They find themselves in Cape Cod Bay pursuing fish, and there is not gear conflict, but certainly a sense of sector conflict going on in a rather limited area of the ocean, and that this would relieve that type of highly contentious conflict that's developed over the years. Is that -- am I remembering that right, Rich? So, that's just one other consideration for NMFS to make in opening up that fishery earlier.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible) I can hold it for tomorrow, if you want.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS:

(Inaudible.)

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, maybe I'll be the last one. I just want to thank the members of this panel who sat here last year and one of the few issues we reached consensus on was to ban the airplanes, if you can remember that little discussion. We've just gone through the best tuna

season we've had, the least contentious tuna season we've had in 2001. 99 percent of the fishermen were quite happy. And the fellows who caught the fish with the -- who harpooned the fish with the airplanes the previous season happened to catch them all again this season, but how they did it, we don't know. It was quite -- you know, whatever they did it was fine with us.

But on behalf of the fishery, I want to thank all the members here who sat on this panel last year and listened to all this stuff and voted, and again, the only -- one of the few issues we had consensus on, to ban these planes which was a very good thing to do. Thank you.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: Okay.

Well, thank you all for spending an evening with the

National Marine Fisheries Service. I thought

Nelson, you said you would take this tomorrow

perhaps? Right.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible) and the eastern bluefin tuna, so that can go under miscellaneous.

MODERATOR CHRISTOPHER ROGERS: We'll start tomorrow morning as scheduled with bycatch

		132
1	issues at 8:30 a.m.	
2		
3	WHEREUPON:	
4		
5	THE MEETING WAS SUSPENDED	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

<u>CERTIFICATE</u>

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
COUNTY OF NORFOLK

I, PAUL T. WALLACE, a Professional Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript represents a complete, true and accurate transcription of the audiographic tape taken in the above entitled matter to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

In witness whereof, I have set my hand and Notary Seal this 8th, day of July, 2002.

PAUL T. WALLACE. Notary Public My Commission Expires October 3, 2008

THIS FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF
THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION

OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT

CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER.